NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW
No. DCXXVII.

FEBRUARY, 1908.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

BY LYMAN J. GAGE, FORMERLY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY; WILLIAM B. RIDGELY, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY; CHARLES A. CONANT; AND CHARLES B. MACDONALD.

I.

THE RELATION OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY TO GENERAL FINANCE.

THE United States Treasury in its relation to the banking and financial interests of the country has occupied, since the creation of the national banking system, to go back no farther, an illogical, not to say an unjustifiable, position. By the National Banking Act, with its several amendments, the Government became sponsor for banking institutions now numbering more than 6,500. The rights, duties, qualifications and responsibilities attached by law to all these institutions were fixed by the Government itself. Having brought these agencies into being, it virtually declared to the citizens of the land: "These are worthy agencies, and they deserve your confidence. For the faithful performance of the duties imposed upon them, and in the interest of your safety, we, the Government, will maintain over them a watchful and detailed supervision, disciplining those unfaithful to duty, while we will peremptorily suspend the power

Copyright, 1908, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of any who shall prove unfit." Clothed with those high warrants and sanctions, the national banks as a whole have made successful appeal to the business world; and these institutions now taken together are under money obligations to the people for a sum in excess of four thousand millions of dollars.

What has been the practical attitude of the Government, as expressed through its Treasury and fiscal department, to the banking agencies it has thus endowed with life? It can be set forth in a single paragraph. Never has the Government itself intrusted its financial interests to the safe-keeping of the agencies it has held out to the people as worthy of their respect and confidence. It has, indeed, on several and divers occasions, taken moneys from the Treasury hoard, and, under peculiarly exacting conditions, it has, for various periods of time, deposited a portion of these hoards with banking institutions; but it has in no way conformed to the general method by which the banking agency is utilized by the business public. It has, in fact, persistently refused to receive from that portion of the public from which it derives its enormous revenues those instruments of credit, known as "checks" and "drafts," which constitute the real currency of commerce and trade. Separate, distinct and aloof from the ordinary financial and industrial life to which, through its revenues and disbursements, it stands closely related, it is persistent in exacting cash in hand from its revenue contributors; while, on the other hand, it has distributed its payments in actual funds through its own special appointees.

In all these particulars, it has been as if the banking agency did not exist, or, if existing, as if it were unworthy of Government use. The excess of its revenues, when excess there has been, was withdrawn from that public service to which through the banks it might have been applied.

This, I say, was illogical. It might, indeed, have lain in the mouth of the great corporations—such as railroads, the Standard Oil Company and other enormous handlers of money values—to say to the Government: "Your ingenious so-called banking system does not commend itself to our respect and confidence. We believe neither in the people with whom we deal, nor in the banks you have created. Our revenues, however derived, must come to us in actual money. The device of checks and drafts, so convenient and economical to the people in their other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affairs, does not appeal to us. Having the power in our relation to do so, we dictate the conditions. Our money, when received, we will lock up; and, in the natural financial intimacies of life, we will stand separate, apart and independent. We justify this action on the ground that your banking system is unsafe."

Now, if it were excusable on this ground for these great corporations to take this arbitrary position—which nobody will affirm—it were inexcusable for the Government to do so, since the Government itself determined and decreed all the qualifications for safety and efficiency which its own creatures should possess.

Was this course of action on the part of the Government necessary for just prudence as to the safety of its funds, or proper economy in administration of its affairs? In answer to the first half of this question, I affirm it to be the fact, demonstrated by careful and thorough examination, that had the Government employed the national banks in centres known as the "reserve cities," depositing with them its revenues, with some just proportion to or regard for the relative capital of those various institutions, with no security from them whatever other than a first lien upon their assets, respectively, there would never have been a dollar of loss to the Government. If, on the other hand, the Government had required, in consideration for these moneys so deposited, an interest return by the banks of, say, two per cent. per annum, the Government would have realized from this source, up to the present time, a total revenue of something more than $70,000,000.

As to economy of administration of the Treasury funds, there would also have been an enormous saving, since the elaborate machinery of the Sub-Treasury and Sub-Treasuries need not have been employed. Nevertheless, the creator has steadily refused to employ its own agencies, while the rest of the business world, obedient to the law of economic advantage, has employed in its multifarious affairs the useful machine of banking-credit which the Government has thus rejected. To add piquancy to this contrast, it might be truthfully said that were the aforesaid large financial corporations to abandon their present methods and adopt instead the example of the Government, and install, each for itself, an "independent treasury," a cry of indignant protest would resound through the length and breadth of the land—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and rightly so, unless it be that our modern system of credit and credit machinery for the transfer of property and payment of accounts, etc., is a delusion and a snare.

If the credit system can be thus characterized, the Government is, no doubt, justified in maintaining its own private purse independent of all things else. It is in that case equally true that every one controlling money values should adopt the same rules. In short, the National Banking Act should be repealed. We are not, however, ready to return to a method closely allied to primitive barter. Concede this, and then the Government is wrong—economically and logically wrong—in its independent Treasury. The disturbing influence on general financial affairs of excessive money-hoarding by the Government has been too often described to require any detailed notice here. If, then, a vote were to be taken among those who have capacity to judge of things in their true relationships, I do not doubt that the proposition to abolish the independent Treasury and substitute for it the use of banking agencies as they *now* exist would receive a preponderating vote. I may be wrong in this opinion. I myself would hesitate, however, to vote in the affirmative on that proposition. I should much prefer that the motion be "laid upon the table" until our banking system can be so amended that it shall be free, or comparatively free, from the perturbations which periodically beset us, bringing in as a consequence a partial or complete suspension of the banking function upon which society depends for the regular ongoing of its business affairs.

I need hardly say that the amendments to which I refer must be in the line of unification or centralization of power. The banking units, whose weakness as they now exist has been so often demonstrated, must receive strength by association together or with some superior commanding agency able both to exercise control and furnish effective support. A central bank or a Government bank of adequate capital properly organized for safety and efficiency is the sort of an agency to which I refer. Great Britain, France and Germany offer good models which we may profitably study.

I would maintain the independent Treasury until such time as our banking system is so re-enforced; because, in spite of the lack of logical reasons for its existence, it has been, and is now, in our imperfect condition, the only agency which can, or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theoretically can, regulate and give to some extent a degree of steadiness to the erratic movement incidental to our financial and banking system as now operated.

By its intervention, the Treasury, on many occasions in the past, has averted threatened financial disaster. Given an always plethoric Treasury, directed by an infallibly wise administrator (one who has never yet appeared), it could, by timely deposits of these hoarded moneys, and by timely withdrawals of the same, in part or in whole, give steadiness and regularity where otherwise there would be irregularity, dislocation and panic. In these regards, the independent Treasury, when endowed with the needful power in money, can, and in my opinion has, to a degree, served the purpose and discharged in a crude way the functions of a great Government or central bank. This service, crude as it has been, often entirely lacking through want of power, often badly directed through lack of wisdom, is a development not anticipated nor foreseen in the laws establishing the independent Treasury. It illustrates an old truth often recognized that even out of evil good may incidentally come. Be the service to which I have referred worth little or much, it cannot safely be counted upon as a valuable factor in the future. The present overflowing Treasury, through changed conditions, may, at no distant date, be in a state of exhaustion. A perfect system of Government finance would, indeed, bring in each day from its sources of revenue a sum exactly adequate to meet its daily expenditures. We ought not, then, to retain permanently the independent Treasury for the sake of its ambiguous and uncertain control as an intermediary in our financial life, with which it should by right interfere to the smallest degree possible.

My conclusion, then, is, first, that the independent Treasury should be abolished whenever and as soon as our present banking system, which has been demonstrated to be faulty, is corrected in the direction I have pointed out rather than described; second, that the perfecting of our banking and currency system —so that it may at all times perform its important function in a safe and effective manner both for the Government and for all the people—is an end demanding the best thought and the most intelligent effort of financial students and political economists, and of all patriotic people who desire for their country what will best make for its economic welfare.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The end so much to be desired cannot, however, be achieved by any thoroughgoing revolutionary action. The proposition is too large, the complex problems too numerous, the involved financial relations of the Government too firmly fixed. To illustrate this, we have the legal-tender notes of the United States, with their special reserve fund of $150,000,000. We are met with the fact of a silver currency of some $600,000,000 possessed of a commercial bullion value of something like half that sum. For the difference between these stand the credit and pledge of parity by the Government. Who is to take the place of the Treasury in the practical work of maintaining equivalencies between these Government obligations and gold? I point also to the artificial status of United States bonds. Now impounded as security for national-bank notes, the question of an "elastic" bank currency is handicapped by the necessity of protecting vested interests, which would be imperilled by any course which would give an open, natural and free market to Government securities.

There is the guaranty of the Government to bank-note issues, an illogical and, I believe, a harmful influence in the currency. There are the established Sub-Treasuries with all their appointments and appointees. There are the great bureaus at Washington, known as the issue and redemption division, with the hundreds composing their personnel, all dear to the heart of the political administration. These reflections bring in the suggestion that "reform" must be by graduated steps, with possibly long intervals between each; it must be effected by modifications rather than by radical changes. The first object to be gained, as it appears to my thought, is the perfecting of the Banking and Currency System. This once placed upon scientific foundations, the next question will be in order, namely, how to bring the Treasury into more natural and more harmonious relations with our general financial interests through a broader utilization of the Bank Agency. LYMAN J. GAGE.

II.

THE NATION'S CURRENCY AND BANKING SYSTEM.

THE dry details, indicating the condition of our banking and monetary system, and suggesting the future of financial affairs, are not, ordinarily, of sufficient interest to the average reader

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to claim the time and attention necessary to a thorough understanding of them; but the subject has been so vividly brought to the fore by the recent stringency, by the efforts to relieve it and by the various suggestions as to how a repetition of it might be obviated, that a wide-spread and general interest in the question seems to have been created.

There is that in the situation itself, at the present moment, which demands the careful consideration of the thoughtful, as to whether our system is all that it should be, and, if not, how it should be reconstructed to meet future emergencies without creating opportunity for other and even more serious contingencies. Without going far into the voluminous figures which substantiate conclusions, a few preliminary facts will aid to the proper study and easier understanding of the necessities confronting those who attempt to correct the imperfections, and will indicate the value of the safeguard required.

No grave and general upheaval of financial affairs comes without more or less warning to those whose business it is to watch the signs of the times. The conditions both at home and abroad, very early in the present year, indicated the probability of a contraction in business in general and a tightness in the money-market, but the extraordinary conditions which developed in October were not foreshadowed to any appreciable extent in the bank reports as a whole up to August 22nd. There was a steady increase in the volume of loans and discounts—an increase due in part to the number of new banks chartered during the year, but mainly to increase in the business of the old associations. Individual deposits, representing fifty per cent. of the banks' liabilities, reached the maximum in the history of the system on May 20th, 1907, when they amounted to $4,322,841,141. The number of depositors in savings-banks reporting—exclusive of those having accounts in savings departments of the State banks of Illinois—increased since 1900, from 5,898,091 to 7,982,893, and the average deposit increased from $404.33 to $437.86. For the current year, individual deposits in all reporting banks aggregate $13,099,635,348—a gain of nearly six billion dollars, or 80 per cent., in the last seven years. The highest record of increase in individual deposits, in the year ending June 30th, 1907, was made by banks in the Western States, where they increased nearly twenty per cent. during the single year.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1891, the outstanding circulation of national banks reached the lowest point in the life of the system since 1865—only about $167,000,000, representing ten per cent. of the stock of money in the United States. There was very little variation from that percentage up to 1900, when the proportion increased to 13.23. On June 30th, 1907, national-bank notes represented 19.38 per cent. of the money in the United States.

Incident to the usual business of clearing, documents termed "Clearing-house certificates," representing lawful money deposited for the purpose, are issued for the convenience of members of the Association in settling balances. Under section 5,192 of the Revised Statutes, such certificates are deemed lawful money in the possession of any Association belonging to the Clearing-house issuing such certificates. Under exceptional circumstances, they have also issued Clearing-house loan certificates, based on bills receivable and other securities approved by the loan committee.

The Director of the Mint, from the most recent and reliable data obtainable, estimates that, at the close of the calendar year of 1906, the stock of money in the world was $14,280,100,000. Eighty-two per cent. of the gold was held by eight countries, as follows: The United States, $1,593,300,000; Germany, $1,030,300,000; Russia, $939,400,000; France, $926,400,000; England, $486,700,000; Austria, $306,400,000; Italy, $215,500,000; Spain, $90,900,000. Over 56 per cent. of the stock of silver was held by the same countries, the United States leading again with $698,700,000.

In 1890, Mulhall estimated the world's banking power at $15,985,000,000, of which the United States was credited with $5,150,000,000. Since that year, the banking power of the United States alone has increased to $12,674,800,000—over 146 per cent.; that of all the other countries has increased only to $16,199,200,000—the banking power of the United States being thus little less than one-half that of the entire world. These colossal proportions and comparisons but imperfectly indicate the enormous extent of the banking and monetary system with which we have to deal in making any radical change.

There has been no lack of warning indications of financial troubles. For the last ten or twelve years there has been an era of advancing prices and of great industrial, commercial and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speculative activity, in all countries of the world. Credits were increased till the limit was reached in the amount of reserve money on which they must be based. For two or three years, it has been constantly more evident that there must be a slackening of the pace if we would avoid a general crisis in commercial affairs. As is always the case, when there is a demand for liquidation, it first manifests itself in the stock-market. For months, there has been a more or less steady decline in quotations. The difficulty in selling bonds became so great that many of the railways have had to raise money for their necessary expenditures through short-time notes instead of by the regular bond issues. Merchants and manufacturers of the highest credit have found it harder and harder to renew loans, and the rates have risen, steadily, for months.

It was under such conditions that we approached the autumn crop-moving period, when there are always withdrawals of balances from the reserve cities. For a time, there was reason to hope that there might be no more than a gradual liquidation of credits which would not develop into a bank or commercial crisis. But, in October, the collapse of a highly speculative corner in stocks dealt in on the "curb" in New York—not even listed on any regular exchange—brought suspicion upon an old and well-established national bank. Examination showed this bank to be entirely solvent; but public interest had been aroused to such an extent that runs developed in New York city on several other banks and trust companies. Some of them were not prepared for co-operation and protection against the sudden demands, and a number of failures followed.

In this emergency the Clearing-house banks of New York issued Clearing-house certificates for use in the payment of balances, and decided to suspend the shipment of currency to out-of-town banks. This example was followed by the central reserve banks and most of the other reserve cities, of necessity precipitating a famine of currency and a serious bank crisis. The means of remittance and collection were almost entirely suspended. Individuals, corporations and even the banks themselves drew and held all the money of any kind they could obtain. A curious feature of the situation was that there was more of a panic among the banks than among the people; but the hardship was to business generally. Every class of business was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interfered with, so that business operations of every kind were curtailed. Factories have suspended, workmen have been thrown out of employment, orders have been cancelled, the moving of crops has been retarded, exports have fallen off at a time of the year when they should be at their highest. Another serious result has been the reduction of the volume of foreign credits available, just at the time when they are most needed to offset the large imports of gold which have been made.

It was not the failure of a few banks which brought on the panic. It was the system which rendered a panic practically inevitable under certain conditions — and they are conditions which can be many times repeated. It was not lack of confidence on the part of the people, but lack of confidence in the banks themselves. They were fearful that the reserve system would break down, and it broke down. They were fearful that a sufficient amount of currency could not be supplied to meet the demands—the demands were all made at once and there was not a sufficient amount to meet them. The remedy lies in improving the reserve system, so that the reserve deposits of the banks shall be kept where they are always and certainly available, and in imparting to our currency system an element of elasticity, so that, when there comes a sudden demand for bank-notes, they can be supplied without obliterating the reserve. This can only be satisfactorily accomplished through the establishment by the Government of a central bank of issue and reserve—the system which is working so satisfactorily in all of the great commercial centres of Europe. It would not only solve the two great problems of our banking system, but would also provide the machinery for conducting Treasury operations with the least disturbance.

The real weakness of our present banking system is the result of the provision regarding reserve deposits, through which the reserves are piled up in central reserve cities, without a sufficient amount of actual cash reserve on hand, so that when an emergency arises the reserves are not reserves at all. It would help against embarrassment to add to the reserve required, all along the line; but the proper solution is to increase the amount and require all reserves to be held in a central bank organized for that purpose. The depositing bank would not only be sure that the funds were always available, but that, as long as it was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solvent, it could go to the central bank and get any amount of cash needed on notes of its customers or other good security. With such a bank to depend on, no solvent bank need ever doubt its ability to meet all possible demands.

The law concerning reserves, as it stands, requires that a minimum reserve of twenty-five per cent. on deposits be held in lawful money in the vaults of the central reserve city banks. The reserve cities must also keep twenty-five per cent. reserve, one-half of which may be on deposit in the central reserve banks. Banks in all other cities are required to keep fifteen per cent., three-fifths of which may be on deposit in reserve or central reserve cities. With any lack of confidence, this system is necessarily a source of weakness instead of strength. Realizing upon what small margins they depend, each bank is, in self-defence, impelled not only to collect its loans, but to withdraw its reserve deposits. Deposits of $10,000,000, in country or non-reserve banks, call for a cash reserve to be kept in those banks of only $600,000, with $900,000 on deposit in reserve city banks. These banks must have in their vaults only $112,500 of the amount, with the same amount on deposit in central reserve cities, where, in turn, there need be on hand but $28,125 representing it. There is, therefore, but $740,625 in cash, kept, unloaned, anywhere, against this deposit of $10,000,000 in the country banks. Of this only $140,625 is outside the banks' own vaults. If there is a reduction in the deposits of the country banks, of $150,000, out of the ten millions, only one and one-half per cent., it calls for more cash than has been kept on hand in reserve banks for the whole ten millions. What wonder that the fall demand for $200,000,000 in currency, for crop-moving, always causes anxiety, and that when it is accompanied by a withdrawal of deposits and curtailment of credits, caused by uneasiness or distrust, the banks are forced to drastic measures in self-defence.

There is nothing new in this situation. It has been known to all students of our banking and currency system, and has been written and talked about for many years. It has produced panic after panic, and a stringency in the money-market every fall for forty years. It was wholly due to this that the crisis of October assumed the phase of a bank panic and spread over the country. There was no other reason at all why the banks as a whole should have become involved, and their business and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that of all of their customers disturbed as it was. All that was needed to have prevented this was a proper system of credit bank-note currency and bank reserves, both of which would have been supplied by a central bank of issue and reserve. There would have been no scarcity of currency, no derangement of domestic exchange and no panic among the banks or among the people.

The only way in which bank-deposit credits can be properly protected from sudden calls, when all banks may be involved at the same time, is by a system of note credits which can be at any time and immediately exchanged for deposit credits. They are essentially the same thing, and they should be daily, hourly, if necessary, convertible from one to the other. With such a system there is no inflation or expansion when a note is paid out, and no contraction when a note is returned. It makes no difference to the bank or to any one but the customer, who uses either at his option, whether the deposit remains in the bank as a credit to be checked against or is taken away in the shape of a circulating note.

Our bond-secured bank-notes offer no help to a bank in sudden calls for deposits. They are a fixed currency, issued on the secured currency principle, as distinguished from the credit or banking principle. When issued they stay out indefinitely, only returning to be renewed when worn out. It is only when the bonds for security can be borrowed or some Government deposit is obtained that they are of any value in meeting an emergency. It will not help the matter to increase the volume of bonds. It would only increase the volume of rigid, unelastic notes. They would only be a power of expansion till they were issued. Then they would stay out, with no tendency to contraction when not needed. There would be no temporary expansion possible to meet the sudden demands of an emergency. We must have a note circulation which can change quickly and automatically in response to demands. Contractibility is quite as necessary as expansibility. Several of the panic reliefs which have at various times been suggested have good points. They would serve a purpose in quieting a panic after it is under way, but not in preventing it. The use of Clearing-house certificates by the banks has been found a very efficient means for their defence, and on many occasions has probably prevented a great number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bank failures during panics. But they are only half-way measures. They carry us no farther than to the inevitable conclusion that we should have a national and central bank of issue and reserve. Clearing-house certificates, which are really credit-notes on a large scale, should be issued by a central bank under Government authority. This would have none of the disadvantages of the other system, while it would have all of the advantages and many more besides.

The real need is for something that will prevent panics, not for something that will relieve them; and the only way to attain this is through the agency of a Governmental bank. The experience of all other countries has demonstrated this. We shall surely have panic after panic till we learn the plain lesson which the others have learned and adopt the only efficient, scientific and proper means to protect our business interests. It is a matter of greater importance to the people at large than it is to the banks themselves. The banks devise ways and means to stand together, with the aid of the Clearing-house, and by suspension or partial suspension of payment to bridge over and avoid failure. But the other business interests of the country are left almost in a state of chaos. The machinery of domestic exchange suddenly stops. Collections and remittances are almost impossible. Manufacturers are forced to suspend. Workmen are thrown out of employment. Business men are forced to fail through no fault of their own. There is no citizen of the United States who is not in danger of more or less loss and embarrassment. And worst of all is the long period of depression which follows a panic, bringing suffering and privation to those who are in no way to blame. The thing which is absolutely essential is a banking system with bank-notes which will be responsive to the demands of business and will as readily contract as expand; with a system of bank reserves which shall be real reserves and always immediately available.

The installation of a central Government bank would be of incalculable value to all of the business interests of the country, and it would also solve the problem of the relations of our Treasury Department to business. It would provide a reliable and efficient system of handling our Government finances, add stability and safety to our banking system, and shield and protect the citizen in all the relations which are so vital to him for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the conduct of his business and the support of his family. When the revenues of the Government are in excess of the expenditures, there is always the problem before the Secretary of the Treasury as to how, quickly and efficiently, to replace in circulation the money which the Government is forced to collect. To deposit it with the banks is the only means available, but that course is unsatisfactory, unsystematic and inefficient. It is always a course provoking criticism and complaint. A central Government bank, to which all revenues could be paid and through which all disbursements could be made, would be far better for the Government and result far better for the people.

Such a bank should not be allowed to do a general commercial business. It should be confined to the Government business, the issue of credit-notes, the receiving of reserve deposits from other banks, the discounting of their paper on approved security or rediscounting of their notes from their customers. It should have the right to deal in bonds of the Government, and probably of States and municipalities, but not in stocks. It should have such authority for dealing in foreign exchange as would enable it to accumulate gold credits abroad and import gold and bullion when needed for its reserve. It should have exclusive right to issue bank-credit notes, and it could thus regulate the issue of notes in accordance with the demand, which would be determined automatically, and with perfect precision, through its relations with other banks. We need make no change in the present system of bond-secured notes of national banks, nor disturb the present volume of currency.

Such a bank would also be a great aid in the establishment of a Postal Savings-bank system, determining at once how the deposits should be handled and invested to prevent such savings-banks only adding to the amount of money which the Government already takes out of circulation. It would also greatly improve the efficiency and value of the Treasury Department, making it a means of assistance and benefit to business, and would make our currency and banking system a source of impregnable strength in times of financial stress. It would absolutely prevent, in the United States, the recurrence of any wide-spread bank panic. It would add to the stability of our business in every line, and give us a banking and financial system equal to any in the world.

The panic of last October only endorsed the lesson of the panics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 1857 to 1893, in demonstrating beyond denial that perfectly solvent banks, if isolated units, without co-operation, cannot protect themselves and save themselves from failure without such suspension of payments as to produce demoralization in all the business of their customers. Well-managed, sound and solvent banks have often been forced to refuse payment, and commercial, industrial and financial affairs have been thrown into confusion in the past, and will be in the future until the Government provides the necessary machinery to protect them in times of excitement. The nations' banks must depend upon the nations. They do in other countries. They must in ours. Our financial stability will be subject to constantly recurring attacks until this plan becomes an established fact.

WILLIAM B. RIDGELY.

III.

THE LESSONS OF THE PANIC.

THE recent financial panic was due chiefly to the excessive manufacture of securities during the past ten years. Every panic has its special phases. While there is a similarity in the evolution of each, yet no two spring from exactly the same causes. The experience of one crisis is the lesson which guards against the same errors in the next; but, after the law has tardily and clumsily patched over the weak spots in old conditions, some new form of enterprise in finance brings on a new period of over-speculation and unwise banking. The panic of 1873 was largely due to over-extension of railways; that of 1893 was precipitated in this country by the danger of departure from the gold standard, although there were deeper causes which affected the whole financial world. In the panic of 1907, demands for capital from the railways had their share, but they were less influential than the abuse of industrial securities.

The essential feature of the recent panic was the collapse in prices of the great mass of securities poured upon the market since the revival of enterprise at the close of the last century. There were two possible dangers in this creation of new securities—some of them might not be good; and even if they were good, the amount might be greater than the available supply of capital would absorb. The difficulties of the recent situation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were, chiefly, that private industries of many kinds were turned into the form of the joint stock company with a rapidity which disregarded important financial safeguards in detail, and created an extensive volume of securities in gross. The absence of proper cash reserves, the issue of large volumes of securities against good-will, and the effort to persuade the public that this good-will would be speedily converted by proper economies into great profits, were among the features common in some respects to all periods of inflation, but carried on this occasion to an unusual degree of variety and ingenuity.

A few far-sighted and resourceful men, impressed with the evils of unrestricted competition, devised the first mergers. When the possibilities of the system were once revealed, men of financial daring, but of less constructive genius, sought to apply the new formula to every industry they could lay their hands on. The possibility of getting rich overnight, by the creation of securities, dawned with such dazzling power upon the mind of the promoter that he was able not only to deceive himself as to the ultimate results, but, by dangling the golden bait before conservative bankers and offering to share with them the spoil, to tempt them as well as the public. Private enterprises were turned into corporate form, promoters approached the heads of established industries with offers to buy out their interest with bonds; the mania to "put together" competing interests spread to every hamlet where there was a mill or a factory.

New issues of securities have gone on during the past decade at an amazing pace. For the United States alone the careful compilation of the "Journal of Commerce" puts total issues in 1906 at $1,637,013,350 and for 1907 at $2,102,552,000. When these amounts are added to estimated amounts of $35,000,000,000 already existing in 1905, it appears that nearly one-third of the wealth of the country is represented by negotiable securities. Careful estimates for the entire world, made by the "*Moniteur des Intérêts Matériels*," put the net demands for new capital in 1903, after eliminating refunding operations, at $1,846,500,000; for 1904, at $2,431,700,000; for 1905, at $3,364,600,000; and for 1906, at $3,125,000,000. The figures for 1907, when fully compiled, are likely to be much larger. The total volume of securities in the world, with many probable omissions, is computed by experts at over one hundred thousand million dollars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is impossible to make comparisons for previous years for all classes of corporations, because the data are not available; but in several great classes, where statistics have been kept, in the United States, including Government issues, steam-railways, street-railways, national banks and trust companies, the par value of securities outstanding increased by nearly 25 per cent. from 1900 to 1905 and by 50 per cent. from 1890 to 1905.

Inevitably the issue of such a mass of new paper upon the world's markets, even if the paper had represented absolutely sound enterprises, would have created an opportunity for speculation such as the world has never seen. By the organization of the American system of dealing in securities, facilities are afforded for frenzied speculation which are lacking in Europe. Among the factors which offer this encouragement are the concentration of idle money from the West in New York when it is not needed for moving the crops; the system of permitting reserve deposits by national banks in New York, Chicago and St. Louis; the system of daily settlements on the New York Stock Exchange, instead of fortnightly settlements as in London, with the wide fluctuations which it causes in rates for call money; the acceptance of cash margins for speculating in securities from persons without financial responsibility to an extent unknown in Europe; the absence of elasticity in the currency system; the employment of national-bank notes instead of gold in local banking reserves; and the lack of any central control of the discount rate or the gold supply. Added to these local factors have been several of world-wide character, of which the large issue of securities and the rapid increase in the production of gold have been important.

It is not possible to deal here with all these elements of the problem. It is proposed only to refer to several which are either of the first importance or have not been given their full weight in other discussions of the subject.

In the first place, there is a fundamental error, appreciated by but few, even among conservative bankers, in the theory that securities represent circulating capital. In fact, they represent, almost invariably, fixed capital,—divisible shares or obligations of railways, buildings and factories. The distinction between fixed and circulating capital is somewhat abstruse for the unprofessional mind; but it means that savings which have been put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into permanent properties cannot be gotten out of that form, while savings which have been put into the ordinary processes of production in the form of raw materials and wages come back within a year, usually in a few months, in the form of cash paid for the articles produced and the labor employed. But, in more concrete form, the manufacturer who employs his capital in buying wool and paying wages to turn it into cloth has reason to expect that the cloth will be sold, and that the transaction will be completed within a limited time. The bank which takes a note based on such a transaction knows that the note will be paid from the proceeds of the sale of the cloth. When the transaction is completed, the money is paid and the debt is extinguished. If the demand for woollen cloths falls off, the manufacturer buys less wool, the amount of cloth produced is smaller, and banking transactions shrink in proportion.

No such quick liquidation of the capital invested,—no such adjustment of supply and demand,—takes place when capital is in the form of stocks and bonds of railways and mills. The capital has been put into permanent form. The divisible shares are easily transferable, through the system of the stock exchanges and transfer offices, and to the untrained investor they doubtless appear to represent circulating capital in a form much more effective and negotiable than the promissory note of the merchant in the hands of a bank. But, when the tide of speculation turns and banks begin to reduce the valuation of securities pledged for loans, there is no automatic law under which the supply of securities decreases, as commercial paper decreases when business declines. If an insufficient supply of capital in the market is confronted by an excessive issue of securities, the struggle to obtain capital in exchange for securities becomes more intense than the fabled struggle of the nations, under the theory of the bi-metallists, to drag over their shivering forms the scanty blanket of the world's gold.

Banks save themselves when securities decline by demanding additional margins. If these margins are not forthcoming, securities are thrown on the market for what they will fetch, prices tumble with a crash, and every broker or speculator is seized with panic. By these processes, while the quantity of securities remains rigid or is increasing, their value expressed in prices shrinks by the pressure of liquidation. It is an application, in a sense,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the same principle which is laid down in the quantity theory of money. Securities fall in the ratio in which the supply of circulating capital has been diminished. The banks are saved, but the investor finds his properties shrunk far below the price he paid; and the speculator on margins, who has been dreaming of a fortune acquired overnight by the upward movement of prices, finds his margins wiped out and his golden dreams turned to leaden nightmares.

When to this condition in the American speculative markets, and to this policy of enormous loans on securities on the part of banks and trust companies, is added a currency system which has no adaptation to modern financial conditions, it is not surprising that panic and loss should occur. The lack of elasticity in the American bank-note system has been so often pointed out that it need not be dwelt upon in this article. There is a very serious menace in the situation, however, which has not yet been much discussed. This is the expansion of bank-note issues under a system which does not keep them related to gold. Thus far in the history of the United States, since the resumption of specie payments in 1879, a combination of happy accidents has blinded the eyes of the public to the danger of issuing notes upon bonds. The danger comes not chiefly from lack of quality in the bonds, but from the paper inflation which would ensue if bond issues became excessive.

Limited as circulation has thus far been to United States bonds, this menace has not confronted the country as a realized fact. It would loom large, however, if the proposition were once seriously entertained of allowing indiscriminate issues of bank-notes upon other classes of bonds. Safeguards regarding the quality of the bonds would afford no protection against the wildest paper inflation if the quantity available were beyond the legitimate currency needs of the country. If municipal bonds alone were admitted to the list of securities for circulation, over $2,000,000,000 would be available. Steam-railway bonds outstanding in 1905 were over $6,000,000,000; and, if only half fell within the provisions of the law prescribing their quality, there would be an opening for an inflation of the paper circulation exceeding in volume anything which has ever taken place in the most destitute southern republic.

The essential danger of bank-note issues on bonds is that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quantity of bonds has no relation to the volume of current business, and notes thus issued are not subject to the great touchstone of the world's values, the ebb and flow of gold between international markets. If $1,000,000,000 in new paper were suddenly infused into the circulation of the United States, the effect would be to drive abroad approximately $1,000,000,000 in gold. This would mean suspension of gold payments, descent to an irredeemable paper basis, and a repetition of the unhappy experience of France with the *assignats* and of our own country with Continental money. The value of the security in liquidation would weigh little against the excess of the quantity of tools of exchange, and the absence of any provision that their quantity should be governed by the tests of values in all sound markets,—redemption in gold on demand and the maintenance of adequate gold reserves.

Curiously enough, the country has been going through a sort of paper inflation of this nature without realizing it. State and private banks and trust companies are usually permitted by State law to carry bank-notes in their reserves. As a matter of fact, they carry all forms of currency; but the fact that they are authorized to hold bank-notes, and are not required to hold lawful money only, as are the national banks, is practically equivalent to permitting them to build up their credits upon the bank-note, which is only another form of credit. If one form of credit can be thus used as a reserve against another, practically no limit is fixed to the excesses of speculation.

What has happened to demonstrate this theory? A glance at the expansion in State and trust-company banking affords the answer. The aggregate figures for all these institutions, except national banks, and including savings-banks, are as follows:

Growth of State Banking.

	1900.	*1907.*
Number of institutions	9,519	13,317
Total resources	$5,841,658,820	$11,168,514,516
Cash reserves	$220,667,109	$391,847,497

This table shows that the State banks and the trust companies have been able, by increasing reserves by about $171,000,000, to increase the volume of their obligations by $5,325,000,000. The reserve stands in the ratio of less than four per cent. of total liabilities. This percentage would be somewhat improved, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course, if only deposits were taken into account, instead of gross liabilities; but, for the purpose in view here, the gross figures will serve equally well as an illustration.

Whence came the cash to increase reserves sufficiently to expand credit by five thousand millions? In any European country, the answer would be that it must have come by the importation of gold. And the gold could be obtained only by making such prices on export commodities and on securities, and such rates for money, as should prove attractive to foreign holders of gold. But, in the United States, expansion of bank-note issues occurred from $246,277,222 on January 1st, 1900, to $687,340,835 on December 28th, 1907. Here was an increase of about $440,000,000 in a form of credit counted by State banks as reserve money,—sufficient to form the tottering foundation of ten thousand millions of an airy structure of new credits! Perhaps those bankers who have manufactured credit through State banking institutions to the extent of five thousand millions are to be congratulated, like Clive, upon their moderation, when the increase in bank-note circulation alone would have permitted them to add another five thousand millions if securities had been manufactured fast enough to afford them the basis for making loans.

A volume might be written upon the dangers of this sort of financing; and yet it has gone on so gradually and unobtrusively that only with the appearance of the assembled figures of the Comptroller's report for the banks of all the States has the amazing character of this inflation been revealed.

What are the remedies against such dangers in future? There are many which might be considered,—the stricter regulation of trust companies, already proposed by Governor Hughes; changes in Stock Exchange methods which would diminish speculation on insufficient margins; regulation of corporations after the English fashion,—not for the purpose of clubbing the corporations over the head, but of protecting the investor; and a currency system which will afford a sheet-anchor in time of stress.

Macaulay declared of the American Constitution that it was "all sail and no anchor." He might have made the same declaration of our existing financial system. When the crisis came, conservative and resourceful skippers, who had watched with forebodings the reckless crowding on of sail by reckless boy captains, came to the front and welded together a few temporary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anchors out of such remnants of conservatism and sound finance as they found at their hands. They saved the ship by warping her off the rocks. What is needed, however, to keep the ship upon a steady course is a strong, permanent and well-tested anchor under the direction of an intelligent and far-sighted skipper with unquestioned power to act. This would be afforded, so far as the banking system is concerned, by the creation of a central bank of issue, with authority to rediscount for other banks, to issue its notes to meet business demands, to keep its reserves in gold, and to regulate its general policy by the state of the foreign exchanges as reflected by the movement of gold.

Every other advanced commercial nation has such an institution. France adopted it under the great Napoleon; Bismarck made it a part of the unification of the German Empire in 1873; backward Spain came to it in 1874; Austria-Hungary and Russia adopted it when they sought to put their finances upon a sane basis. Even Japan rejected our system of a bond-based currency issued by local banks, and intrusted her currency system to the Bank of Japan in 1882. Italy practically adopted the system after the bank scandals of 1893; and as recently as 1904 a central bank went into operation in Sweden, and in 1907 in the Swiss Republic. Only by such an institution, directed by officers approved by the Government, can the requisite unity be given to the financial system. The unity of action secured tardily in all our great panics by the union of leaders for self-preservation would become an established and smooth-working system.

A central bank stands like a Gibraltar amidst the waves of financial turmoil, where isolated banking units perish. With such a power of regulating the money-market, the grotesque gyrations of call rates for money, which make our market a wonder for civilized nations, would cease. With such an institution, the disgraceful spectacle of currency suspension, in time of profound peace, by all the banks of the richest nation in the world would be no longer possible. But, until some of these reforms are inaugurated, New York can never permanently command foreign capital at will, nor become a centre upon which foreign exchange would be drawn in transactions outside her own immediate local needs. Our present financial system is the outgrowth of Treasury needs in 1863. It handicaps this country in the contest with financial rivals as completely as an old side-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wheeler of 1863 would be handicapped in the race across the ocean with the "Lusitania" or the "Mauretania," or as the old wooden ship-of-the-line would be outclassed under the fire of a modern battle-ship.

CHARLES A. CONANT.

IV.

OUR PRESENT CRISIS.

IN an effort to judge concisely the character, the causes and the probable result of the 1907 panic, I have made a comparison between the present panic and the other great panics which have occurred in this country, and which have to a greater or less degree involved the world's markets. By "great panic" I mean one in which the country's banks have practically all suspended payments. This country has experienced five panics of that description—in 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893 and 1907. There were a number of intermediate disturbances or semi-panics, but they did not prostrate the country commercially and industrially. The similarity of the conditions which prevailed at these periods forces one to the conclusion that, in each and every instance, the same underlying cause occasioned the inevitable crisis.

The most striking similarity is to be found in the index price of commodities. In each panic, the index number reached its greatest altitude. In no other year can one find such high prices for commodities as prevailed immediately before and up to these panic periods. Our own index numbers do not run back to the early panics, but Dr. Soetbeer and Mr. Saurbeck clearly demonstrate the high range of commodity prices in 1837, 1857 and 1873. Dr. Soetbeer took one hundred Hamburg articles and fourteen articles of British export. Mr. Saurbeck took forty-five English prices. In America both Dun and Bradstreet show that commodity prices in June, 1907, were the highest ever known in America, ranging, as the index number did, some fifty per cent. higher than in 1906.

The question naturally arises: What caused the commodity prices to rise to such heights before these panic periods? The fundamental cause in every instance was the increase in the circulating medium of exchange, or money. That increase, though more or less gradual, has always been accompanied and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

followed by an extension of business in every quarter, apparent national prosperity, speculation in stocks and land, until credit became unduly expanded to a point of inflation. That condition has been accompanied by national and personal extravagance, resulting usually in over-production and over-stocking; until, finally, in a cloudless sky, in the midst of plenty, every one is astonished to hear a crash.

Chaos ensues. One to five years of stern economies and readjustment follow. Then everything becomes normal, and again we pluck up courage and start on our ride for another fall. We learn little by our experience—and in a generation one forgets!

It is all Human Nature. The natural phenomena of this panic of 1907 in no wise vary, in any marked degree, from those which have attended every other great panic.

Political economists all recognize that the political, industrial and social elements which make up our life are very closely related to the circulating medium of exchange recognized among nations. Alter that by greatly increasing or diminishing its volume, particularly the former, either by the operation of natural economic laws, or by legislating a substitute for money, and the political, industrial and social elements must adjust themselves to the new conditions, and, before that adjustment can be completed, almost invariably a panic ensues.

It is interesting and illuminating to read the Presidents' Messages in the years of the great panics. They all attribute the respective panics to our wretched banking system; yet we have done nothing to rectify it, and probably we shall not. The four previous panics occurred, respectively, in the inaugural years of the Presidents, and in two of the panics—namely, those of President Van Buren and President Grant—a special session of Congress was called to act upon Currency Legislation. Another curious coincidence is that the great New York fire occurred in 1835, the Chicago fire in 1871 and the San Francisco fire in 1905, in each instance two years before the panic.

Let us take up the panics in order.

Panic of 1837.—The States in 1832 substituted metallic for paper currency, and in 1835 paid off the national debt, at the same time abandoning the United States Bank, though Congress rechartered the Bank, and President Jackson vetoed it.

The Government deposits were taken from the United States

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bank and were placed in the various banks in different sections of the country. These banks were permitted to issue bank paper, which was done to excess. That was the fundamental cause of the panic of 1837. The banks suspended specie payments in May; in the fall the United States Treasury receipts were insufficient to defray the expenses of the Government.

Following are a few extracts from President Van Buren's special Message to Congress. His Message first states that there was great diversity of opinion as to the real causes. He attributed the panic to:

"Over-action in all departments of business, stimulated to destructive consequences by excessive issue of bank paper, and by other facilities for the establishment and enlargement of credit. The consequences of this redundancy of credit, and the spirit of reckless speculation engendered by it, were a foreign debt contracted by our citizens, estimated in March last at more than $30,000,000; the extension to traders in the interior of our country of credit for supplies greatly beyond the wants of the people; the investment of $39,000,000 in unproductive public lands; . . . the creation of debts for an almost countless amount for real estate in existing and anticipated cities and villages, equally unproductive, and at prices which now seem to have been greatly disproportionate to its real value; the expenditure of immense sums in improvements which in many cases have been found to have been ruinously improvident; deflection of much of the proceeds which should have been applied to other matters, such as the exportation of wheat to Europe [the States imported wheat in 1837]; . . . and, finally, without enumerating other injurious results, the rapid growth among all classes, and especially in our great commercial cities, of luxurious habits of living founded on merely fancied welfare, and detrimental alike to the industry, the resources and the morals of the country."

In 1837 the average of commodity prices reached the highest point touched, up to that time, in the history of the country.

Panic of 1857.—In 1849 gold was discovered in California. The total world's production of gold from 1700 to 1800 was $1,300,000,000; from 1800 to 1850, $820,000,000; and for the seven years, 1850 to 1856, inclusive, $820,000,000.* This enormous increase in the production of gold, half of which occurred in the United States alone, caused an excessive extension of credits with resultant inflation. Everybody was eager to get rich immediately. Hence the fundamental cause of the panic of 1857 was this enormous production of gold.

* Soetbeer's "Materialism."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Listen to President Buchanan's reference to the panic in his Message to Congress, December 8th, 1857:

"In all former revulsions, the blame might be fairly attributed to a variety of co-operating causes, but not so on the present occasion. It is apparent that our existing misfortunes have proceeded from our extravagant and vicious system of paper currency and bank credits, inciting the people to wild speculation and gambling in stocks. These revulsions must continue to recur at successive intervals, so long as the amount of paper currency and bank loans and discounts shall be left at the discretion of 1,400 irresponsible banking institutions, which, from the very law of their nature, will consult the interests of their stockholders rather than the public welfare."

In 1857 the average price of commodities again reached the high point of 1837.

Panic of 1873.—The absorption of $400,000,000 of gold by Germany to place the Empire on a gold basis, and the five billion francs paid Germany as a war indemnity, together with the enormous increase in the production of silver, which all the world except England and Germany recognized as a medium of exchange, was fundamentally the cause of this panic. The silver production amounted to $40,000,000 annually in the fifties, $55,000,000 in the sixties and $91,000,000 in the seventies. In 1872 silver bullion prices commenced to decline, breaking for the first time in twenty years sixty pence an ounce.

After our Civil War, with an unsecured paper currency, we plunged into the excesses of credit inflation and speculation with nothing to back it. The $50,000,000 of gold which we produced per annum we exported. Our imports exceeded our exports by $109,000,000. No wonder this panic lasted five years, from 1873 to 1878.

The silver question aggravated this situation, as it did in the period of 1893 to 1896 to a much greater degree.

President Grant's Message relating to the panic of 1873 sounds somewhat like President Roosevelt's groping financial utterances in his last Message. The following are some extracts from President Grant's Message:

"In the midst of great National prosperity, a financial crisis has occurred which has brought low fortunes of gigantic proportions. . . . We can never have permanent prosperity until a specie basis is reached. . . . Exports must exceed imports. . . . Elasticity of circulating medium is desired. . . . Patent to the most casual observer that much more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

currency is required to transact the legitimate trade of the country during the fall and winter months while the various crops are being removed."

The average commodity prices in 1873 reached a new high record in the country's history up to that date.

Panic of 1893.—The fundamental causes of this panic were the enormous production of silver and our silver coinage acts, causing inflation of an unstable currency, intensified by the demonetization of silver which had commenced throughout the world. After fifteen years of prosperity, every one was lulled to sleep. The lesson of 1873 was forgotten. Credits were inflated; imports for the first time in years exceeded exports; land speculation was rampant; commodity prices, for the first time in twenty years, rose close to the high prices of 1873; merchants were overstocked; many railroads had been "skinned" to enrich their executive committees; and our gold reserves were depleted. This panic lasted four years owing to the insistence by one-half of our population upon bi-metallism, or the free coinage of silver at the rate of sixteen to one. Our currency was finally recognized as being on a gold basis by the election of President McKinley in 1896. That was the first bright lining to the clouds we had seen in four years. President Cleveland called a special session of Congress to deal with the currency situation on August 8th, 1893, and in his Message he said:

"The existence of alarm and an extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives. With plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production in manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distress and fear has sprung up on every side. Many institutions have suspended because assets were not immediately available to meet the demands of frightened depositors. Depositors and individuals are content to keep in hand the money they are usually anxious to loan, and those engaged in legitimate business are surprised to find that securities for their loans, though heretofore satisfactory, are no longer accepted. Fortunes supposed to be fixed are now becoming conjectural, and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

"I believe these things are principally chargeable to Congressional Legislation touching the purchase and coinage of silver by the general Government."

Panic of 1907.—This panic in no wise varies in any degree, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its natural phenomena, from the other great panics. The fundamental cause of the present panic is the enormous gold production. During the last ten years, inclusive of 1907, $3,200,000,000 of gold has been produced, one-half as much again as all the gold produced in the 150 years from 1700 to 1850. In 1900 the production was $254,000,000; to-day it is $407,000,000 for 1907.

This augmentation of the circulating medium has had its inevitable natural result in rapidly rising values of commodities to a record level, causing production to be unduly stimulated, with unparalleled expansion of railroad improvements and manufacturing extensions throughout the entire business world — the banks, in consequence, extending their credits to a point of inflation. The above concomitants of all panics were also attended with the usual speculation in real estate and stocks.

The excessive inflation of credit was finally checked by the exhaustion of the currency upon which credit should be based, as was evidenced by the rapid rise of discount rates to a prohibitive level; railroads which in 1902 issued bonds on a three-per-cent. basis were obliged to pay eight to ten per cent. on short-term notes. These rates forced retrenchment, and retrenchment caused the edifice of credit to topple over.

It is probably true that President Roosevelt's attitude toward swollen fortunes, railroads and other corporations has hastened the crisis; but my personal opinion is that those who attribute this panic to his attitude are wrong, and that he in no sense has even been a contributory cause. His attacks drew to the surface, somewhat violently perhaps, some of the most deeply rooted evils which have always lain at the base of every great panic—that is, dishonesty in the administration of great aggregations of capital, the exposure and correction of which, if successful, will work for the lasting benefit of the entire country. My only wish is that our President in his denunciatory policies would absorb in his heart—making the whole country *feel* that it is there—the spirit expressed by his acknowledged ideal, President Lincoln, in those words contained in his last Inaugural Address: "With malice toward none, with charity for all." This would obviate the danger which even the President's best friends fear, namely, that of arraying class against class.

Corporations, whether trusts or not, honestly managed, are a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national bulwark, and equally advantageous to rich and poor alike. The poorer man with his surplus has always the opportunity to invest his earnings in any corporation he desires, and it is now the policy of all enlightened corporations to give special terms for investment to their employees; but in view of the insurance, Alton, Metropolitan and other disclosures, it must be apparent to the densest intellect that the public must be guaranteed against dishonest manipulation of corporation affairs.

The best reason I can give why this panic arrived ahead of time, the twenty-year period, is the distrust and lack of confidence which was disseminated throughout the country by the insurance disclosures, and then the revelations which indicated that the executive committees of our largest and strongest corporations, directed by men whose names the country had been taught to conjure with, were running those corporations largely for their own benefit.

Public confidence was destroyed. President Roosevelt, seeing his opportunity, has rightfully pressed the situation, so that we are reasonably sure of corrective legislation.

It is now popular for the so-called "yellow" writers to attribute this panic to Stock-Exchange speculation. As a matter of fact, there never was a panic in which the Stock Exchanges were so little involved. To start with, the business on the Stock Exchange during the past year has been much less than in 1901, 1905 or 1906. Following are the figures:

	Bonds.	*Stocks.*
1901	$981,781,010	251,786,341 shares.
1905	1,016,034,550	260,220,317 shares.
1906	676,004,330	280,179,477 shares.
1907	540,000,000	196,000,000 shares.

When one considers the large increase in securities listed on the Stock Exchange, there was relatively less speculation in 1906 than in 1901. Furthermore, the loans in 1907 of the New York Stock Exchange members with the banks have been less than any year since 1900.

The United States Comptroller's report of September 4th, 1906, showed that New York banks were loaning $100,000,000 less on stocks, bonds, other personal securities and mortgages, than on August 25th, 1905. The Comptroller's report for 1907 is not yet out, but any one conversant with Stock-Exchange

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loans knows that Stock-Exchange houses rarely have been such small borrowers of money.

Naturally, one asks: What does the $1,100,000,000 loans and discounts represent if it does not represent Stock-Exchange borrowings? It represents loans on municipality obligations, largely those of New York City, loans on underwritings of bonds, stocks and short-time notes of railways, also mortgages and advances to large railway and industrial corporations which have found it impossible to sell their paper. Such loans as the above are fixed and practically impossible to liquidate. The central reserve cities hold unusually small amounts of commercial paper. This class of paper has gone to the country banks. It was estimated by a Chicago banker that the country banks held $300,000,000 on November 1st, 1907; this paper is gradually being paid off, and the cash goes to the country and stays there. In three years the country banks have increased their loans $658,000,000 against $70,000,000 in central reserve cities and $213,000,000 in other reserve cities, a total of $941,000,000 increase in loans, while specie and legal tenders increased only $40,000,000. In this enormous increase in loans and small increase in cash lay the weakness of the situation.

The above exposition should clearly demonstrate how little the Stock Exchange has had to do with the panic of 1907.

Stock speculation, like land speculation, and extension of loans by banks, is one of the concomitant factors in every panic. It is an incident. The Stock Exchange is a barometer of business. People usually sell that which they can sell most quickly and most easily, so as to protect their more involved commitments; consequently, the Stock Exchange feels all impending trouble first.

The country at large confuses Wall Street with the Stock Exchange. The Stock Exchange is the servant of the investors all over the country. Twenty-five per cent. of the total wealth of the country is in securities, and the Stock Exchange represents the majority of that wealth in listed bonds and stocks. "Wall Street" represents nothing but individual capitalists whose financial schemes are carried out without the recognition or assistance of the Stock Exchange.

In any event, the Stock Exchange is the only large body of men doing an extensive business that gives absolute publicity to all its doings and spreads it broadcast.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After comparing these various panics, one finds much comfort in the thought that the present panic has been forced on before its legitimate time. It has found us with our farmers rich, our exports in excess of our imports this calendar year to the extent of something over $435,000,000; our industries are not overstocked, and our merchants are not greatly extended. I believe this panic will prove more like that of 1857, and after one year's dull, not prostrate, business, we shall, when the election is over and the reductions to be made in the tariff are thoroughly understood, rapidly regain confidence and give the world a merry war for supremacy in trade, particularly so with honest administration of our trusts and not too much Governmental interference, for they will then be able to give a most excellent account of themselves. The country will realize that combinations of industries assure us against undue invasion of foreign manufacturers and effect a greater export trade, thus bringing about greater stability in wages and employment.

In view of the Currency Legislation which Congress proposes enacting this winter, I think President Buchanan's words have a special significance when he refers to "1,400 irresponsible banking institutions which, from the very law of their nature, will consult the interests of their stockholders rather than the public welfare." The "law of their nature" of our 6,500 national banks and 7,500 other banks is the same as that of the 1,400 banks in 1857, and there can be little doubt that President Buchanan's statement in a measure applies to the banks of to-day. The people believe that there is far too much speculation in the majority of our national banks. It occurs to me that to base the new currency bill upon the assets of the national banks as they stand would not be for the best interests of the people at large, as compared with the establishment of a central institution to be managed by the Government in the interests of the people. Why place the control of an elastic currency in the hands of institutions which have a significant interest in adjusting money rates to the production of dividends for their stockholders?

One reads a great deal about an elastic-currency law to avert panics and secure stability to our industrial enterprises; but I do not think our legislators realize how important it is for the well-being and happiness of the masses that the elastic-cur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rency laws should not only protect the farmer and general business man in times of extended industrial activity, but should also provide for securing to the laborers and small depositors their savings. Any one who witnessed a run on any of the trust or savings institutions some months ago must be convinced of the correctness of this proposition. I think the British Government, in giving to its people a postal savings-bank, has done as much for the happiness of the British workman as any Government has done for its people in a century.

I doubt if the credit-currency scheme will protect the people. The banks and bankers will get the best of it; and, in the event of a great panic, with the artifices and devices which are sure to grow up under any such system, I believe the people would be apt to become thoroughly frightened and withdraw their savings from circulation, in the future as in the past. Thus hoarding would not be averted, and a panic would ensue.

I do not pretend to be a financial critic, but I have a strong conviction that the dignity and welfare of our Government will best be served by establishing a central bank based upon our national banking institutions, forcing national banks to support the central bank on any basis the authorities deem wisest, regardless of prerogatives now assumed or vested.

Again, as an adjunct to the central bank, I believe a National postal savings-bank should be an integral part of the system. A postal savings-bank would protect the poorer classes and make their rest happier and their days more contented when panics rage and their employment is threatened. Further, it would make the poor man a better citizen, causing him to feel more a part of his country. In England the limit of postal savings is $1,000 for each individual, annuities $500 and life-insurance $500. About ten million people have deposits in the British postal savings-banks, and the average deposit is about $75.

However, any bill which would give greater elasticity to our currency would mitigate our present plight. Given such a bill and a continuance of the gold production, which we have every reason to believe will not diminish in the near future, and values cannot permanently remain at their present level; but soon the economies forced upon us by the panic will regain for us confidence, and we shall once more find ourselves on the waves of prosperity.

CHARLES B. MACDONALD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKISHNESS AND STATESMANSHIP.*

BY THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ROSEBERY, K.G.

Bookishness and statesmanship are, one would think, scarcely compatible. Nothing, indeed, could seem more discordant and incompatible than the life of the library and the life of politics. The man of books may steal through life like a shadow, happy with his simple pleasures, like a caterpillar on a broad, green leaf, untortured by the travail of authorship or the candor of the critic, and leave it with his name unknown, until his library be sold, should he perchance have books to sell.

The man of politics leads possibly a more useful, certainly a more arduous, career. He lives in the public eye, almost in the public grasp. Out-of-doors, there is the reporter; in the seclusion of his home, there is the interviewer; both, presumably, hungry to receive the ideas as they pass through his capacious brain; though some go so far as to declare that the interviewer and the reporter are less the seekers than the sought, less the pursuers than the pursued.

Alert, bustling, visible, deriving even a certain popularity from the fact of being known by sight; speaking to his engagements whether he has anything to say or not; appearing on his platform whether he be brisk and well, or sick and sorry—like an actor, only that he has to find his own words; bringing together and keeping together, as well as may be, all sorts and conditions of men; with one eye apparently on the political weather, and the other, it is to be hoped, on his political conscience,—which is usually kept for him by a number of other people—a hurricane of a life, the essential quality of which is publicity.

I refer only to obvious externals, and only enough of these to indicate the natural antipathy between the life of politics and

* The substance of an address delivered at Edinburgh some time ago.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the life of books. Yet Mr. Gladstone, who rode the whirlwind and directed the storm of politics, was bookish to an extreme degree. He had not, indeed, reached the superlative and morbid form of bookishness when a man is called a "book-worm." The fresh breezes of a thousand active interests prevented such a development. But, with encouragement and fostering circumstances, had he been nurtured in literary traditions, like his great rival, had his health been feeble, it is not difficult to imagine him a book-worm, immersed in folios.

But as things were, he loved books as much as a man may without a suspicion of bibliomania. As a matter of fact, he had none of what is technically called bibliomania; to first editions, or broad margins, or vellum copies he was indifferent.

Had he been a very wealthy man, even this form of the noble disease might have taken him. As it was, he loved collecting, buying, handling books. It was a joy to him to arrange with his own hands the books in his library. It was a sport to him to hunt down books in sale catalogues. It was a sacred trust to him to preserve the little treasures of his youth—a classic or two that he had at Eton, the book given to him by Hannah More.

No one could have seen him reading in the Temple of Peace, as he significantly called his study, and have deemed it possible for him to be happy in any other capacity. Those who had witnessed that sight must have felt persuaded that, when he retired from public life in 1875, nothing could ever draw him from his beloved retreat. They might well have anticipated that with old books, old friends, old trees, with a hundred avenues of study to complete or explore, with a vast experience of life and affairs to discuss, with trees to cut and plant and worship—for he was a tree-worshipper as well—and, above all, with the vital core and responsibility of a living faith pervading him, he might well rest and be thankful.

It was his extraordinary energy, enthusiasm and faith in great causes that were the salt that prevented his stagnation into mere bookishness. But he had another safeguard still. It was his principle in reading to make his exports balance his imports—he took in a great deal, but he put forth a great deal. His close study of a book was pretty sure to precede an article on it.

I reckon over all this to explain, as far as I can, the paradox of a bookman who was at the same time a man of practical busi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness and affairs; one of the rarest of all combinations. Take the case of Prime Ministers as an average representation of men of affairs. Harley was a book-lover, but even he was rather a collector than a reader. Bolingbroke, who was perhaps Prime Minister for a few hours, was a book-lover after his fall, or said he was. Stanhope had a library which still exists at Chevening, preserved in a separate room—a priceless example of the book collection of a Minister in the eighteenth century. Sunderland founded a great library. Then we come to Walpole. The sublime solace of books, which soothed even the gnawing ambition of his fiercest enemy, was denied to him. No one deplored this after his resignation more than himself. Once, on finding a friend reading in his own library at Houghton, he expressed this feeling: "I wish I took as much delight in reading as you do; it would be the means of alleviating many tedious hours in my present retirement; but, to my misfortune, I derive no pleasure from such pursuits." Again, in the same room he said to Henry Fox: "You can read. It is a great happiness. I totally neglected it when I was in business, which has been the whole of my life, and to such a degree that I cannot now read a page—a warning to all Ministers."

From Walpole onwards, we meet with no bookish Prime Minister till we get to Lord Grenville. He was, no doubt, a man of strong literary tastes, but does not come into competition with Mr. Gladstone as an omnivorous reader. But a friend who used to visit him gives a picture of his old age, sitting summer and winter on the same sofa, with his favorite books on the shelves just over his head—Roger Ascham among them, Milton always within reach. He, at any rate, in his sixty-sixth year was clear as to the choice between literature and politics.

The next possibly bookish Prime Minister was Canning; but, with a literary side all his life, he was only Prime Minister for a few months. Melbourne was a great reader, and like Mr. Gladstone a great reader of theology; but he left behind him a library of odd volumes, which puts him out of the category of book-lovers. Sir Robert Peel, like some of the statesmen of the last century, came to the business of politics as a brilliant specimen of Oxford scholarship. Lord John Russell was, perhaps, more of a writer than a reader of books. The only book, I think, mentioned by Lord Palmerston in his correspondence is "Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingsby." Then we come to the author of "Coningsby," "born," as he says, "in a library," more bookish, perhaps, than Mr. Gladstone in early, and less in later, life.

Once, when I was a child, I was taken to see Hatfield. In the library, we saw a tall, thin figure carrying a huge volume. The housekeeper paused, with awe, saying, "That is Lord Robert Cecil." It was a bookish figure, then outside politics, but later Prime Minister.

Shall we find outside the list of Prime Ministers many in the secure latitudes of the past who compete with Mr. Gladstone as being bookish men in high ministerial office? Clarendon is beyond my horizon. There is Addison, who was a Secretary of State, but so indifferent a one as to fail entirely in one point of comparison. There is Burke, a mighty force in politics and in letters, but never in such office as to demonstrate himself a great Minister; any more than Charles James Fox, who held office for too short a time. Charles Fox had a real passion for literature, could talk of it the whole day and over the whole range of it. He, I think, in a real love of books, approaches most nearly to Mr. Gladstone, and both had a common devotion to Homer. Homer was the author Charles Fox most loved to read; but he would also read all the novels he could get hold of. In conversation, he would range over the whole field of literature, with zest and passion, without apparently once straying into politics. A friend has recorded how in a day he would discuss Homer and Virgil, Æschylus and Euripides, Milton and Massinger, Pope and Addison, Gibbon and Blackstone, Sophocles and Shakespeare, Metastasio, Congreve and Vanbrugh, Cowper, Fielding, Burns. He almost convinces himself that Burns is a better poet than Cowper! But he concludes by saying, finely enough, that poetry is the great refreshment of the human mind. No one, surely, can deny that Fox was a man of books. But he is not a parallel for the combination which in Mr. Gladstone was unique, in that he was only a Minister for a few months, once under circumstances dubious, if not sinister, and once when dying. He was not then, as Gladstone was, carrying on simultaneously a great career as a statesman in office and a delightful life in a library.

Moreover, all this except in the case of the History of James II, which slumbers on our shelves in majestic quarto, was without result. Nor was there in him, as I read him, the passionate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concentration and practical application of reading that we saw in Mr. Gladstone. "His Favorite Sultana Queen," as with his royal ancestors, "was sauntering," and sauntering was abhorrent and impossible to Mr. Gladstone. Charles Fox, at any rate, after ruining himself at cards, could sit down and derive an instant solace from Theocritus.

As a rule, the public men of the last century seem to have been fairly well equipped in what Captain Dalgetty called "the humanities"; they would have blushed not to understand, or not to appear to understand, a Latin quotation; they could bandy and hit over them as Pulteney did with Walpole, but they do not seem to have been men of books. There are, perhaps, two signal exceptions, and I do not feel perfectly sure of even one of these two; I mean Carteret and Chesterfield.

The great exemplar in the eighteenth century of the combination of literature and politics was, undoubtedly, Chesterfield. Perhaps the only startling deficiency in his intellectual equipment was his unaccountable ignorance of the mother tongue of that Hanoverian dynasty which he was so anxious to serve. It is difficult to understand on what claim or merit was based Chesterfield's literary throne. That he occupied one is sufficiently evident from the fact that Johnson, who was no courtier, had thought of dedicating his Dictionary to him. A few essays, more or less anonymous, were all the productions known to his contemporaries—essays which appeal but little to us. His letters to his son and to his godson, on which rests his fame, and which to some of us seem dreary enough, were posthumous.

In these letters, however, we find symptoms of his bookishness. From them we may suppose him versed in the literature of his own country, of France and perhaps of Italy. In England, his idol is Bolingbroke. In France, he sees such perfection that one would infer that he worships there a literary polytheism. The only Italian poets that he thinks worth reading are Tasso and Ariosto. He deliberately excludes Dante, a veto which seems an abiding slur on his perception; and which in Mr. Gladstone's judgment would have constituted him a sort of literary outlaw.

In spite of Chesterfield's undoubted love of reading, he places on record an injunction which strikes him altogether out of the category of thorough bookishness. "Lay aside," he solemnly says, "the best book whenever you can go into the best company;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, depend upon it, you change for the better." Perhaps when we remember that the best society, in the highest sense, is rarely attainable, he is right. But we might not all agree as to what constitutes the best society.

I believe that nowhere in history, so far as I know, is there an instance of so intensely bookish a man as Mr. Gladstone, who was at the same time so consummate a man of affairs. I mean by bookishness the general love of books — reading, buying, handling, hunting them. The combination in his case is unique, and it will probably remain so. Day by day, the calls of public life become more and more exacting, absorbing, imperious. Each fresh development of them makes them more and more unsuitable for the student and the recluse. Literature is constantly becoming less and less necessary for the politician. During the first half of the past century, a classical quotation was considered the indispensable ornament of a parliamentary speech.

Among great men of action, we recall Frederick's love of letters, and Napoleon's travelling library. Among statesmen, we think of Pitt's sofa with its shelf of thumbed classics; and of Fox, a far more ardent lover of books, exchanging them and his garden for the House of Commons almost with tears; and of Gladstone's Temple of Peace. Surely, even if it be not the best, it is the happiest way. There is not, perhaps, too much happiness in the life of any statesman. But no one who knew him could think of Mr. Gladstone otherwise than as being happy, and one of the main sources of his happiness was his bookishness. Where, as in his case, the mind absorbs and uses the books, and the books do not cloud and embarrass the mind, the purpose of the statesman and the eloquence of the orator gather force from books as a river takes the hues and gathers up the springs of the region it traverses.

There is no royal road to success in public life; what suits one will not suit another. But putting politics and success out of the question, if a man wants to develop his faculties to the utmost advantage, and to combine the greatest amount of work with the greatest amount of happiness, he cannot do better than imitate the methods of study, the economy of time and the regularity of life practised by the illustrious Mr. Gladstone.

ROSEBERY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENCYCLICAL AGAINST MODERNISM.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.LTT.

Pope Pius X is in the fifth year of his pontificate. He began as a liberal Pope, proposing to reform all things in Christ, and for about two years he seemed bent upon carrying out his ideal. But suddenly there came a change; the environment of the Roman Curia was too strong for him, and they persuaded him to follow in the footsteps of Pius IX, and oppose Reform as the most dangerous of heresies. He began as a broad-minded, warm-hearted, tolerant, conciliatory, lovable Pope, the humble servant of Christ, popular with all classes of people, who were ready to rally about him with enthusiasm for the work of reform. He now appears in his attitude towards the French Episcopate and the Italian Catholic Nationalists, in the decisions of the Biblical Commission, and especially in the new Syllabus and Encyclical, as the deadly foe which must be overthrown at all hazards.

How can such a transformation be explained? Some see in him a man to be pitied for his weakness in the hands of an ecclesiastical Camarilla, who make him a real prisoner of the Vatican, because they do not permit him to see the truth and reality of the outer world, but only matters and things as they represent them to him. But the mass of the voters of Italy and France cannot make this discrimination; they regard clericalism as the great enemy of the people and the Roman hierarchy as the deadly foe which must be overthrown at all hazards.

It is difficult for an American to appreciate the situation in the Latin countries, where the people are Catholic, but the masses of the men are anti-clerical. We are accustomed to free churches in a free state. We cannot appreciate this state of war, and the injustices and hardships that result from it. In Italy the people are so bitterly anti-clerical that the highest dignitaries

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Papal court have been insulted in the streets of Rome, and it is unsafe for them to appear in public without the protection of that very Italian Government which they ordinarily ignore and despise. Under such circumstances, one would naturally suppose that the Curia would pursue a prudent policy. But they have chosen the reverse, and are doing all in their power to stir up strife all over the Christian world with a madness that is the sure precursor of ruin. They have issued a new Syllabus of errors and an Encyclical against Modernism; they propose a new Inquisition; they are hurrying on the canonization of Pius IX; they are even proposing another infallible dogma, the Assumption of the Virgin, and a recalling of the Vatican Council to enhance still further the authority of the Pope, and protect it from the supposed encroachments of modern States. Pius IX, by his arbitrary measures, brought on the destruction of the temporal power of the Papacy; Pius X is on the way to still more serious results.

The Syllabus is a collection of sixty-five statements which are condemned as errors. These statements are not, so far as I have been able to trace them, the verbal statements of any one, save the authors of the Syllabus; but they are based upon statements made by Loisy, Tyrrell and other Catholic scholars whose writings have been put on the Index. I have traced a considerable number of these in their writings; in no single instance are the exact words of these writings given; but their supposed ideas, with some of the principal words, are put into entirely new sentences composed by the authors of the Syllabus. It is easy to see what grave injustice is thereby done to these scholars. They are deprived of the right of stating and explaining their own opinions; but their ideas are first interpreted, or, rather, misinterpreted, by their enemies, then put into statements which mingle their words with the words of their enemies. Their ideas are wrested and distorted; and then they are held up before the world as guilty of serious errors for these very statements composed by their enemies; and, finally, they are charged with temerity and disrespect of authority, if they question the validity of these statements, or disclaim any responsibility for them. I shall give an example. The twenty-second error of the Syllabus reads as follows:

"The dogmas which the Church gives out as revealed are not truths

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which have fallen down from heaven, but are an interpretation of religious facts, which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort."

Loisy says ("The Gospel and the Church," p. 210):

"The conceptions that the Church presents as revealed dogmas are not truths fallen from heaven, *and preserved by religious tradition in the precise form in which they first appeared. The historian sees* in them the interpretation of religious facts, acquired by a laborious effort of theological thought. *Though the dogmas may be Divine in origin and substance, they are human in structure and composition.*"

This statement of Loisy is careful, accurate and well guarded. It is difficult to see how any one who knows anything of Biblical Theology and the history of dogma can doubt it. These Roman scholastics who know neither Bible nor history, and make the scholastic theology the universal norm, may deny it; but they had no right to misrepresent Loisy by leaving out the qualifying clauses which were essential to express his meaning. I have italicized the most important of these.

We cannot dwell upon the Syllabus, for we must give our space to a study of the Encyclical. This Encyclical is addressed, like all other documents of the same kind, to the Episcopate throughout the world. It is thus in a sense œcumenical; but it does not on that account belong to the category of infallible documents: for the Pope does not therein "define a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal Church." He describes Modernism, defines certain errors and prescribes disciplinary procedure against them. There is no definition of doctrine, except so far as the condemnation of errors may be regarded as an implication of different opinions, which in many cases, at least, may be several and not single, and in no case a precise definition of a doctrine. The Encyclical, therefore, belongs to a class of documents, issued by the Pope, which may contain mistaken judgments liable to correction and change. The Canon Law requires that they should be recognized as authoritative, as regulating external obedience and submission in conduct; but they do not bind the conscience nor require internal consent involving submission of the judgment and change of opinion or conscientious convictions. A Catholic scholar has the right, and in some cases the duty, of questioning their validity, especially when, as is the case with this Encyclical, his opinions are misrepresented, his motives and character blackened,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and he is threatened with ecclesiastical discipline on false or mistaken charges. He may do what has often been done in similar circumstances—appeal from a Pope ill informed to a Pope well informed. It would be difficult to find an instance in modern history in which the elementary principles of justice have been so thoroughly disregarded as in the recent Papal decree of excommunication against the unknown authors, and all who assisted them in the composition of the "*Il Programma dei Modernisti, Risposta All' Enciclica di Pio X: 'Pascendi Dominici Gregis'*"; in which several representative Italian priests show very clearly that their views are misrepresented in the Encyclical. The Encyclical describes the opinions of the Modernists, and then excommunicates those who complain that the description is incorrect, and that without knowing their names, or permitting them to be heard in self-defence. The Encyclical is directed against the doctrines of the Modernists. Who are the Modernists? The name is given by the Encyclical to those known throughout the world as liberal Catholics. I know of no previous use of the term as a party designation, except in the religious struggles in Holland between liberal and conservative Protestants. The terms "modern views," "modern men" and similar expressions are not uncommon; but "Modernist" as applied to a religious party in the Catholic Church is unknown to our dictionaries. Liberal Catholics do not, so far as I know, object to the designation, if it carries with it the natural meaning that they are Modernists in their attitude towards Theology, as distinguishing them from Mediævalists; but they do object to the term if it implies the description given of them in the Encyclical, which they regard as a caricature and utter misrepresentation.

The Encyclical begins with an analysis of Modernist teaching. This analysis cannot be found in the writings of the Modernists; for, according to the Encyclical: "Since the Modernists employ a very clever artifice, namely, to present their doctrines without order or systematic arrangement into one whole, scattered and disjointed, one from another—it will be of advantage to bring their teachings together here into one group, and to point out the connection between them, and thus to pass to an examination of the sources of the errors." The analysis that follows is, therefore, avowedly not an analysis for which any Modernist is responsible, but one for which the Encyclical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone is responsible. The analysis of Modernism is this: "Agnosticism is its philosophical foundation," "the negative part of the system"; "Vital Immanence is its positive part." This is the illustration:

"In the person of Christ, they say, Science and History encounter nothing that is not human. Therefore, in virtue of the first canon deduced from Agnosticism, whatever there is in His history suggestive of the divine must be rejected. Then, according to the second canon, the historical person of Christ was transfigured by faith; therefore, everything that raises it above historical conditions must be removed. Lastly, the third canon, which lays down that the person of Christ has been disfigured by faith, requires that everything should be excluded: deeds and words and all else that is not in keeping with His character, circumstances and education, and with the place and time in which He lived."

The Encyclical goes on to say: "There are many Catholics, yea, and priests, too, who say these things openly, and they boast that they are going to reform the Church by these ravings."

Now, if this were a fair description of the Modernists, and it were true that there were many such Catholic priests, no one could rightly blame the Pope for issuing the Encyclical against them, for such opinions are certainly destructive of the Catholic Faith. But who are these Catholic agnostics? Loisy and Tyrrell, the chief Roman Catholic liberals of our day, who are under severe discipline of the Roman Curia, are not such agnostics. Their views are clearly stated in numerous published writings. Fogazzaro and the writers of the "*Rinnovamento*" are not agnostics. The authors of the "*Risposta*" say distinctly that this charge is false. If there are such agnostic Catholics, let the Curia proceed against them and no one can justly complain. But, in fact, they are giving a philosophical basis to the opinions of the liberal Catholics which, so far as it appears, is entirely hypothetical, devised in scholastic brains, which have formulated a category for these liberals which they refuse and disclaim; and they have proceeded against the above-mentioned liberal Catholics to the extent of excommunication, as if they were what they really are not. The Curia blacken their doctrines and characters, and then excommunicate them for being blackened. As Tyrrell says (London "Times," September 30th, 1907):

"It is plain that Modernists are, because logically they ought to be,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agnostics and atheists. . . The whole of this vast controversial structure is poised by a most ingenious, logical *tour de force* on the apex of a science-theory and psychology that are as strange as astrology to the modern mind, and are practically unknown outside Seminary walls, save to the historian of philosophy. Touch this science-theory, and the whole argument is in ruins."

Such a procedure against these Modernists has been recently justified by a member of the Curia, who said: "Well, if they are not such agnostics they still are guilty of heresy in other respects, and therefore have no reason to complain of injustice." And this leads us to the consideration of some other descriptions of the Modernists. Modernism is represented as "the Synthesis of all Heresies." It is quite convenient, therefore, for any one so disposed, to charge a Catholic scholar with being a Modernist, if he has written, or spoken, anything that might be regarded as heretical.

The next most serious charge against the Modernists is that they hold to the "intrinsic evolution of dogma." It is quite true that some liberal Catholics, like Loisy, make great use of the principle of evolution in their study of dogma; but many of them do not. As Tyrrell says ("Scylla and Charybdis," p. 335): "Liberal Catholics are not cast in one mould like Seminary students; nor are all admirers of Newman, or Loisy, sworn to a servile imitation of their views. I am in some respects much more old-fashioned than either, in other respects much more new-fashioned." Tyrrell himself questions Newman's theory of development, and takes a much more conservative position. Furthermore, it is certain that the implication of the Encyclical, that modern Criticism, Biblical and Historical, is based on the doctrine of development, is altogether false. It is based upon an induction of truths and facts as strictly as in the case of any other Science. If critics have adopted the principle of development, it is simply because it seems best to explain all the facts as determined by induction. They are just as ready as are the students of Natural Science to accept any theory, provisionally, that seems best to account for the facts.

It seems quite evident that the Encyclical intends to classify all the disciples of Newman among the Modernists. I feel assured that that is not the intention of the Pope, but it is the intention of the scholastic authors of the Encyclical. The way

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in which they oppose evolution and development of dogma, and the value of probable evidence and religious certitude, strikes against the most characteristic principles of Newman, which made it possible for him and his followers to be and remain Catholics. One of these scholastics who is credited by rumor, sustained by internal evidence, as one of the chief authors of the Encyclical, is known as a lifelong opponent of Newman. I have it on excellent authority that a Roman Cardinal said that "if Newman were now living he would be classed as a heretic." This is not at all surprising. It is a thankless task in the Roman Church to be defenders of the Faith. The greatest apologists have been discredited in Rome: Bellarmine, Bossuet, Möhler, Schell and now Newman. It is a common opinion among writers on Symbolics that it is impossible for the scholar to know what Rome really teaches. The greatest scholars who build on the œcumenical documents and all official decisions of the Church, and think that they are defenders of Roman orthodoxy, are almost certain to be condemned by the ecclesiastics of Rome, who are determined to keep in their own hands the exclusive interpretation of the Faith.

It is impracticable to go through the document and discuss its details, which would show that the Encyclical is really a trap to catch the unwary—indeed, any person who, in any respect, differs in opinion with the Roman scholastics. It will be sufficient to cite their own summary statement of the errors of the Modernist Reformers:

"From all that has preceded, some idea may be gained of the reforming mania which possesses them: in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten. Reform of philosophy, especially in the seminaries: the scholastic philosophy is to be relegated to the history of philosophy among obsolete systems, and the young men are to be taught modern philosophy, which alone is true and suited to the times in which we live. Reform of theology: rational theology is to have modern philosophy for its foundation, and positive theology is to be founded on the history of dogma. As for history, it must be for the future written and taught only according to their modern methods and principles. Dogmas and their evolution are to be harmonized with science and history. In the catechism no dogmas are to be inserted except those that have been duly reformed and are within the capacity of the people. Regarding worship, the number of external devotions is to be reduced, or at least steps must be taken to prevent their further increase, though, indeed, some of the admirers of symbol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head. Ecclesiastical government requires to be reformed in all its branches, but especially in its disciplinary and dogmatic parts. Its spirit and its external manifestations must be put in harmony with the public conscience, which is now wholly for democracy; a share in ecclesiastical government should therefore be given to the lower ranks of the clergy, and even to the laity, and authority should be decentralized. The Roman Congregations, and especially the Index and the Holy Office, are to be reformed. The ecclesiastic authority must change its line of conduct in the social and political world; while keeping outside political and social organization, it must adapt itself to those which exist in order to penetrate them with its spirit. With regard to morals, they adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are more important than the passive, both in the estimation in which they must be held and in the exercise of them. The clergy are asked to return to their ancient lowliness and poverty, and in their ideas and action to be guided by the principles of Modernism; and there are some who, echoing the teaching of their Protestant masters, would like the suppression of ecclesiastical celibacy. What is there left in the Church which is not to be reformed according to their principles?"

To this we might add the query, What Catholic outside the Roman Curia does not desire one or more of these reforms? Unless I am greatly mistaken, a very large portion of educated Catholic bishops, priests and laymen in France, Switzerland, Germany, Great Britain and America are smitten by one or more of these condemnations. When now to this is added the condemnation of the separation of Church and State and the denial of the right of the Catholic citizen "to work for the common good, in the way he thinks best, without troubling himself about the authority of the Church," and the rejection of the principle that "to trace out and prescribe for the citizen any line of conduct, on any pretext whatsoever, is to be guilty of an abuse of ecclesiastical authority"; it is difficult to see how a Catholic can be obedient to the Encyclical and be a good citizen of any modern State. If an attempt were to be made in Great Britain, Germany or America to carry out these principles, it is certain that clericalism would be regarded as the great enemy there, as it is now in most Catholic countries.

The Encyclical, therefore, is a thoroughgoing attack on Modernism, not simply upon liberal Catholics, but upon all that is characteristic of the modern age of the world, in Philosophy, Science, Biblical Criticism, History, Education, and Political and Social Life. It is an effort to overcome Modernism by Mediæval-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism, by making the scholastic Philosophy and Theology of the Middle Ages the norm for all things in all time. The Encyclical is *thorough;* but, like many other historic examples of such thoroughness, it is blind to the consequences of such a policy. It brought Charles II and his ministers to the scaffold, and has destroyed many another brilliant career. If the scholastic philosophy and theology of Thomas Aquinas is to be the universal norm for the Roman Catholic Church, the Roman Church thereby divests itself of Catholicity, for it sins against the established principles of Catholicity, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus.*" It antagonizes not only the modern world, but no less truly the ancient Church, which knew nothing of scholasticism, and still more Jesus Christ and His Apostles, who knew nothing of the principles and methods of the Greek philosophers. Apostolicity is the historic test of a genuine Christianity—not Scholasticism. The Roman scholars are fond of giving the logical consequences of Modernist theories; let them consider the logical consequences of their own position, which would change the creed from "One holy, catholic and apostolic Church" to "one Roman and scholastic Church."

It is well known that Thomas Aquinas was regarded in his day as a heretic and a reformer. The Aristotelian philosophy was condemned at first as sharply as Modern philosophy is in this Encyclical. The authors of the "*Risposta*" claim that they are the true successors of the scholastic theologians, in that they adhere to their spirit of investigation rather than to their stereotyped modes of thought and statement. So Tyrrell says ("Scylla and Charybdis," p. 350):

> "I have the sincerest veneration for the truly theological spirit of my earliest guide, St. Thomas Aquinas; but I have very little for the drilled school of theologists who invoke his name, and swear by the letter of his work to the destruction of its spirit."

The scholastic theology is built upon the Aristotelian philosophy as expounded especially by the mediæval scholastics, of whom Thomas Aquinas was the greatest. All Roman Catholic doctrines since have been stated on the basis of that philosophy and the scholastic methods of Aquinas. But the ancient Creeds were constructed with reference to the principles of the Platonic philosophy. There is a basis of union between the two, but there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are also irreconcilable differences. The teachings of Jesus and His Apostles were on the basis of the Old Testament, and had no manner of relation to either Plato or Aristotle. Which is to be the master of theology, Aristotle or Plato or Christ? The Encyclical virtually dethrones Christ and enthrones St. Thomas as the vicar of Aristotle.

I said in this REVIEW, in my article on "Reform in the Catholic Church," that Leo XIII had taken an important step in reform when he called Catholic theologians away from the newer scholasticism to the study of the greatest of the scholastics, Thomas Aquinas. I have not changed my opinion. But in fact this reform has been more nominal than real, for the reason that it has been obeyed only in form and not in spirit. Any one can see, who will study the system of the chief Roman scholastics at the present time, such as Billot and Janssen, that, while they use the forms of St. Thomas and base themselves on his system, they really introduce into the system scholastic materials, new and old, which are not homogeneous with St. Thomas, but which make a heterogeneous system that St. Thomas himself would be the first to repudiate. How, for instance, can they adapt the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin to the system of St. Thomas when he expressly denies it. The movement in their hands is a sham and a fraud.

The Faith of the Church, according to Catholic doctrine, is a sacred deposit derived from Jesus Christ and His Apostles, whose substance remains unchangeably the same. The Church can only interpret it, and apply it to new circumstances and conditions. As I understand them, the so-called Modernists agree to that. Loisy distinctly says in the extract given above (which is carefully omitted in the statement of error), that "though dogmas may be divine in origin and substance they are human in structure and composition." Tyrrell has returned to what he regards as the "earlier and stricter view." "Understanding by 'dogma' a religious truth imposed authoritatively as the Word of God, not as a conclusion of theological reflection, it rejects the very notion of the development, and still more of the multiplication, of dogmas, and acquiesces cordially in the patristic identification of novelty and heresy ("Scylla and Charybdis," pp. 4-5). According to Loisy, the substance of dogma is divine and unchangeable, the structure and composition are human and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changeable. According to Tyrrell, the dogmas are unchangeable because they are imposed authoritatively as the Word of God, not as a conclusion of theological reflection; in other words, he does not recognize the theological form as dogma. It is just this distinction that the scholastic authors of the Encyclical refuse to make. They dare not say that the scholastic form of the dogmas and the Aristotelian philosophy that shapes their statements were original, apostolic and divine; but, by failing to discriminate between the form and the substance of doctrine, and by maintaining that the dogmas in their scholastic form are normative, and that the scholastic dogma is unchangeable and irreformable, they really imply the divine origin of the scholastic form as well as the apostolic substance; and this, at bottom, is the whole quarrel between the Curia and the Modernists. As Tyrrell says (London "Times," October 1st):

"For the Middle Ages with their statical modes of thought, their crude conceptions of government and authority, derived from Pagan Imperialism, their view of physical law as analogous to civil law, imposed or abrogated at the will of the lawgivers, there was perhaps no other way of apprehending Christianity, which, however, is older than, and therefore separable from, these categories. The Encyclical holds to such categories still, but, rightly or wrongly, the world has swept them aside; nor will any argument, however ingenious, which assumes their validity, receive the slightest attention. No such *instauratio omnium* need be hoped or feared."

The general description of the Modernists given by the Encyclical is so apart from reality that the first impression naturally is that the best way to deal with it is to ignore it, or to recognize it by agreeing in the reprobation of such Modernists, and affirming that they do not exist in "our diocese." This seems to be the present attitude of the American Episcopate. But the second part of the document prescribes a new Inquisition and the organization of a vigilance committee in every diocese, with the purpose of banishing from theological seminaries and the Catholic press and every position of influence, every one who has the least trace, or suspicion, of Modernism, or favors it or condones it in any measure. If the plan of the new Inquisition can be carried out, it is difficult to see how any but a genuine Mediævalist can escape. But it is evident that the plan is too detailed and too drastic, and not sufficiently flexible to make it practicable in many parts of the world, and it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain that there will be an immense reluctance and every kind of passive resistance to the enforcement of these rules. It is true that it is ordained:

"That the Bishops of all dioceses, a year after the publication of these letters, and every three years thenceforward, furnish the Holy See with a diligent and sworn report on all the prescriptions contained in them, and on the doctrines that find currency among the clergy, and especially in the seminaries and other Catholic institutions, and we impose the like obligation on the Generals of religious orders with regard to those under them."

We shall wait to see whether the Bishops and Generals of orders will altogether comply with these commands. This great responsibility is thrown upon them without their advice, knowledge or consent. The Bishops have their rights in the divine constitution of the Church as well as the Pope, and these rights are protected by the same Canon Law that protects the Pope's; and, unless I am greatly mistaken, these rights are infringed upon in an unprecedented manner by this arbitrary ordinance of the present Pope. All the Bishops are successors of the Apostles; the Pope is the primate of the Bishops as St. Peter was of the Apostles. The Pope no more absorbs unto himself the whole authority in the government of the Church than did St. Peter.

The Vatican Council, when it defined the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, at the same time asserted, as it could not fail to do without heresy, that this was "without prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which Bishops, who have been set of the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, feed and govern each his own flock as true pastors." And yet in this Encyclical, the Pope, without consultation with the episcopate, but solely under the advice of certain unnamed cardinals and other members of the Roman Curia, issues an ordinance requiring a "sworn report" from the Bishops as to their fidelity in enforcing his new Inquisition. If that is not an usurpation of authority and an enslavement of the episcopate, it is difficult to imagine what could be regarded as such. If Jesus Christ and His Apostles committed all ecclesiastical authority to the episcopate as the successors of the Apostles, it is no longer exercised by them in the Roman Church; but their place has been taken by a Curial body in Rome appointed by the Popes and responsible only to the Popes, but without any divine rights whatsoever. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are the Cardinals, who are really bishops, priests and deacons of the province of Rome, exalted to be princes of the Church, even the deacons being high above Metropolitans and Patriarchs. They may have the divine right to govern the Roman province, but they have no divine right to govern the universal Church. There are also the Generals of the religious orders of every name, monks, mendicants and brethren, massing all the influence of these Associations in Rome with a local influence and practical authority transcending, and sometimes overreaching and overcoming, the influence of the episcopate scattered and divided throughout the world. The General of the Jesuits is called the Black Pope; more powerful than any one in Rome but the real Pope. None of these orders, none of these Generals of orders, has any part in the divine constitution of the Church, and any part they take in it is in defiance of the divine rights of the episcopate. There are the hosts of *monsignori,* appointed by the Popes as their court officials, who have as their chief functions to transact as officials the business of the Church. These have no part in the divine constitution of the Church, and yet they take a very important part in its government. These three groups of officials are really the governing body of the Roman Church, not only the power behind the throne, but the power that so surrounds the throne that nothing can be done except by them and through them. Even the Bishops only secure a hearing through them. Time and again an agreement between the Pope and a visiting Bishop has been overruled, and even denied after the departure of the Bishop from Rome. The treatment of the French episcopate, during the recent troubles, has been most shameful. Again and again have their decisions been overruled by the Curia; and, finally, as I have it on excellent authority, their very names were signed to an official document without their knowledge or consent. Truly, there is no hope for the Catholic Church until this Camarilla can be overthrown.

The "Saint" of Fogazzaro tells the Pope of this essential fault in the government of the Church when he says:

"Perhaps your Holiness has not yet made proof of it; but the spirit of domination would exercise itself also upon you. Yield not to it, Holy Father! To you belongs the government of the Church; permit not that others govern you, suffer not that your power be as a glove for the invisible hands of others. Have public counsellors, and let these be the Bishops, united often in national councils."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alas! Pope Pius X has yielded, as so many others before him, to this irresponsible, invisible and secret domination, and the Bishops throughout the world are summoned to obey as slaves of their master. The "Saint" of Fogazzaro indicates clearly to the Pope the four evil spirits which threaten the ruin of the Catholic Church: The Spirit of Falsehood, The Spirit of Domination, The Spirit of Avarice, The Spirit of Immobility.

The Encyclical is evidently pervaded by these spirits, and shows clearly and unmistakably that the Roman Curia is determined, in the temper of these evil spirits, to resist and overcome any and every effort for reform. It would banish from the Church all the reformers that are named Modernists; it would give them over to Satan, or to Protestants, or to another Old Catholic sect. It does not wish the Reunion of Christendom, the peace and unity of the Christian Church; but simply and alone a body that will be submissive without question to its domination in doctrine and life, not only by external obedience of conformity, but by the internal obedience of a submissive conscience and an enslaved intellect.

I have a great respect for the person of the present Pope and reverence for his high office; and I regard the Catholic episcopate and priesthood as a devout and noble body of Christian men, and the Catholic Church on the whole as in a sound and healthful condition, ripe for reform and ready to reach forth for the highest ideals of Christianity. The Roman Curia is the canker, the running-sore, of the Papacy which is responsible for all the mischief. The worse it is the better, for that makes all the more evident the necessity of removing it at all hazards. I have said nothing but what hosts of Catholics of all ranks are saying at the present time, who are deeply grieved over the present situation. Once more the gates of hell are open in Rome, and evil spirits of all kinds are broken loose to corrupt and destroy the Church of God. They will do incalculable injury to-day as they have in the past, but our Lord Himself gave the reassuring word: "The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."

CHARLES A. BRIGGS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LEGITIMACY OF THE CLOSET-DRAMA.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS.

A PROFESSOR of English literature at Yale, to whom we are indebted for a valuable study of the rise of Romanticism in England in the eighteenth century, recently published a paper entitled "Retrospects of the Drama." To a small group of his readers the most striking of his assertions is his declaration that "the closet drama is a quite legitimate product of literary art," and that "the playhouse has no monopoly of the dramatic form." And one of this small group cannot resist the temptation to take this declaration as a text, and to ask whether it is well founded or not. Is the so-called closet-drama really legitimate?

To a large majority of the students of English literature, this inquiry will probably seem impertinent. To them the assertion of the legitimacy of the closet-drama is merely the statement of an indisputable fact; and they did not need the arguments and the illustrations by means of which Professor Beers has sought to establish his contention. But there is a growing minority of students of the drama, who will feel themselves moved to sharp dissent, and who will totally reject the assertion that "the playhouse has no monopoly of the dramatic form."

They are prepared to maintain that this statement reveals a misunderstanding of the essential principles of the drama, a misunderstanding which seems to them little short of monstrous. They believe that the playhouse has now, has had in the past and must always have a monopoly of the dramatic form. They cannot recognize the legitimacy of a play which is not intended to be played. They know that the great dramatist of every period when the drama has flourished has always planned his plays for performance in the theatre of his own time, by the actors of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own time and before the spectators of his own time. And they feel a strong desire to analyze closely the arguments which Professor Beers adduces to sustain the legitimacy of that closet-drama which they abhor as a bastard pretender to the dramatic crown, and which they reject as the offspring of the unwillingness, or the inability, of certain poets to acquire the craft of the theatre,—the special craft which makes the dramatist what he is.

It was the acute Pascal who said that half of the art of writing consisted in the precision of the definitions; and, therefore, it is best to begin by asking ourselves what a closet-drama is. Probably no one of its admirers would dispute a definition to the effect that it is a play not intended to be played. It is a poem *in dialogue,—conceived with no thought of the actual theatre.* It is a poem in dialogue,—a piece of literature, pure and simple, not contaminated by any subservience to the playhouse, the players or the playgoers. It is wrought solely for the reader in the library, without any regard for the demands of possible spectators in the auditorium. Its essence is to be sought in the obvious fact that the poet who essays it is firm in the conviction that "the playhouse has no monopoly of the dramatic form." Sometimes, indeed, the poet has gone so far as to declare his deliberate desire so to shape his work that its performance in the theatre would be absolutely impossible. Byron, for one, not only disregarded any playhouse, he violently rejected it in advance. Swinburne, it is true, seems to have thrust aside the theatre of his own time and yet to have believed that his dramatic poems might have been performed in the semi-mediæval playhouse of three centuries ago. But, when all is said, we can rest on the definition that the closet-drama is specifically intended for the closet itself, for the library and not for the stage. It is something which has assumed the outer form of a play, but which is emphatically not to be performed in a theatre.

With the acceptance of this definition we are in a position to consider Professor Beers's assertion that "the English closet-drama of the nineteenth century is an important body of literature, of higher intellectual value than all the stage-plays produced in England during the same period." This assertion might be justified without proving the legitimacy of the closet-drama. Many poets have wasted their time and ours on the so-called "pastoral"; and most of them have left us only empty arti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ficialities. Perhaps a later criticism will hold the closet-drama to be as unsatisfactory as the pastoral is now seen to be. Professor Beers likes the closet-drama, and thinks that there is no need of enumerating its "triumphs"; and then he cites Byron's "Manfred," Landor's "Gebir," George Eliot's "Spanish Gypsy," Horne's "Orion," Beddoes's "Death's Jest-Book," Arnold's "Empedocles on Etna," Tennyson's "Becket," Browning's "Pippa Passes" and Swinburne's "Atalanta in Calydon." Of course, it is only by a slip of Professor Beers's memory that we find in this list "Orion," Horne's famous "farthing epic."

As we read this catalogue we can see the advantage of a preliminary definition. Several of these dramatic poems cannot fairly be included in any enumeration of the "triumphs" of the closet-drama, because they stand outside the definition. These subtractions from the catalogue of closet-dramas, when this is strictly defined, fall into two classes. First, we may consider the group represented by Tennyson's "Becket." If a closet-drama is a dramatic poem not intended to be played, then "Becket" is not a closet-drama, for Tennyson did intend it to be played. And Tennyson was not the author of a single closet-drama, since he meant all his plays to be acted and was even intensely anxious that they should be seen in the theatre, revealing his readiness to make whatsoever modifications, suppression or additions the managers might suggest to him. That they met with little success on the stage itself is beside the point; this can be accounted for either by asserting that the laureate was without the dramaturgic faculty or by admitting that he did not take the trouble to master the necessary technic of the theatre. What is true of Tennyson is true of Browning, at least so far as "Strafford" and "A Blot in the 'Scutcheon" are concerned; these dramas were written not only to be acted, but to be acted by one particular actor. And as Browning had Macready in view, so Shelley had Miss O'Neill in view when he wrote the "Cenci." Coleridge composed "Remorse" to be performed, and it was performed, just as Johnson wrote "Irene" to be performed as it was performed. All of Tennyson's plays, most of Browning's, as well as Shelley's and Coleridge's, are therefore not fairly to be enumerated as triumphs of the closet-drama. They are the failures of the playhouse or the rejected of the theatre. Their authors were not originally thinking only of the solitary reader in the library; they had in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind the massed spectators of the auditorium. All of them longed for the actual theatre. They were all eager for the ordeal by fire before the footlights.

There can be no question that plays of this first class, intended for the playhouse, even if they never reached actual performance, and still more when they failed to achieve success on the stage, are to be excluded from any consideration of the closet-drama. In fact, they are properly to be rated among the stage-plays of whose intellectual value Professor Beers has expressed a low opinion. And when they are deducted, any catalogue of the triumphs of the closet-drama must seem sadly shrunken. How many of the poems which are lumped together in Professor Beers's list were actually composed without some vague, faint hope that perhaps some day a fit stage might present itself for their performance? George Eliot, for example, wrote the "Spanish Gypsy" after she had formed her infelicitous connection with Lewes, a dramatist himself and a critic of the acted drama. Did she write for the reader only, without any remotest expectation that some day her poem in dialogue might also move an audience in the theatre? Did Longfellow know that the "Spanish Student" was unactable? He was glad enough to have the "Masque of Pandora" set to music and performed in the theatre before an actual audience.

While there can be no doubt as to the propriety of striking out from the category of the closet-drama a host of dramatic poems which belong to this first group, there may be a question as to the fairness of deducting those which belong to a second group. And yet the dramatic poems of this other class can be considered as closet-dramas only by stretching the definition. This second group includes Arnold's "Empedocles on Etna" and Swinburne's "Atalanta in Calydon," and all the other imitations of Greek tragedy. The most obvious characteristics of these attempts to resuscitate a departed form is to be found in the fact that they are deliberate imitations. They are exercises in poetry to be ranked with the anatomies of the old painters. They are *pastiches,* as the French call them; and the poet has found his chief interest in recalling the flavor of a day that has gone forever. Although they contain not a little dialogue, they have scarcely more than the husk of the drama, since the Greek poets upon whom these English poets have chosen to model themselves, were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not always and of necessity dramatic. We need to remember that in Greece the drama belonged to a very early type, when the purely dramatic had been only imperfectly differentiated from the lyric and the epic. Greek tragedy had been slowly evolved out of the chorus, and it retained to the end abundant survivals from its earlier state. In Æschylus, and even in Sophocles, lyric and epic elements are often almost as important as the dramatic element.

It needs to be said also that these English imitations of Greek tragedy, delightful as they are to the expert, are of interest only to the chosen few. They are totally devoid of that broad appeal to the public as a whole which is ever the essential quality of all real drama. They are poetic exercises, no more and no less; and they may reveal the range of the metrical artist's accomplishment and his ingenuity in grappling with the endless difficulties of a resuscitation which can never be really successful, since it is frankly impossible for a modern poet to put himself back into the skin of a Greek of old, and to strip himself of all the accretions of thought and feeling that he has inherited from the long centuries separating him from the Athenians. "Atalanta in Calydon" may be the most Greek of all English imitations of Attic tragedy; but none the less is it intensely modern and intensely English. It is not by imitations, however adroit and however skilful, that a poet can establish his fame, even though an imitation or two may serve to broaden our appreciation of his craftsmanship.

Lowell was considering Swinburne's "Atalanta in Calydon" when he declared that "every attempt at reproducing a bygone excellence by external imitation of it, or even by applying the rules which analytic criticism has formulated from the study of it, has resulted in producing the artificial, not the artistic." And in the same essay there is another passage which also demands quotation here: "The higher kinds of literature, the only kinds that live on, because they had life at the start, are not the fabric of scholarship, of criticism, diligently studying and as diligently copying the best models, but are much rather born of some genetic principle in the character of the people and the age that produces them."

When we strike out of the enumeration of the triumphs of the closet-drama the imitations of Greek drama and also the plays

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intended to be acted, even if they failed of performance or failed on performance, the catalogue is seen to be curtailed; but we cannot deny that it still contains examples of weight, Byron's and Landor's and Swinburne's. If, however, we examine these remaining examples, and if we ask ourselves whether they are remembered for their own sake or chiefly because they were written by poets who have won fame by other works, we discover that these closet-dramas have really contributed very little to the reputation of their authors. We recall "Gebir" solely because it was written by Landor, and we do not remember Landor primarily as the author of "Gebir." George Eliot does not hold her position in the history of English literature because she composed the "Spanish Gypsy." Of all the millions who have taken Longfellow's lyrics to heart, there are very few who are even aware that he wrote "Christus, a Mystery."

Perhaps it is hardly too much to say that we might blot out of existence the closet-drama which Professor Beers admires as "an important body of literature" of high intellectual value, without greatly impairing the renown of the English poets who have condescended to the poem in dialogue. No doubt Byron would suffer, more or less, from the loss of "Manfred," and Swinburne would be the poorer for the disappearance of the Mary Stuart trilogy; but the rest of them would lose very little. Their reputation would be as solidly buttressed, without these closet-dramas, as it is with them. And to say this, to suggest that these dramatic poems are negligible, that they have not called forth their authors' fullest powers, that they are only the surplusage of the poets' fame, that they shine mainly by the glory reflected from the other works of their makers,—to say this is to pose the vital question whether the closet-drama is really worth while.

One reason why the closet-drama fails to justify itself is because it is too easy. Nothing is more stimulating to the artist than the necessity of grappling with difficulty. Then and then only is he forced to put forth his whole strength. To make his work easier in any way, to relax the bonds, to let down the bars,—this is not to help the artist; it is to hinder him from lofty achievement. As Huxley once said, it is when a man can do as he pleases that his troubles begin. A strong nature is ever anxious for a wrestle with an opposing force; and he knows very well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how the strain braces his muscles. An acute French critic, M. Paul Stapfer, once explained that "the instinct which leads us to measure a part of our esteem for a work of art by the effort it has cost, and by the difficulty vanquished, is not unsound, since it is founded on the fact that true beauty is a pearl of great price, hidden at the bottom of the sea, and out of the reach of those who lack courage to struggle for it."

There is a significant passage in Professor Beers's essay in which he sets forth what he conceives to be the advantages of the writers of closet-dramas when they are contrasted with the playwrights who plan their work for the actual theatre:

> "As the closet-dramatist is not bound to consider the practical exigencies of the theatre, to consult the prejudices of the manager or the spectators, fill the pockets of the company, or provide a rôle for a star performer, he has, in many ways, a freer hand than the professional playwright. He need not sacrifice truth of character and probability of plot to the need of highly accentuated situations. He does not have to consider whether a speech is too long, too ornate in diction, too deeply thoughtful for recitation by an actor. If the action lags at certain points let it lag. In short, as the aim of the closet-dramatist is other than the playwright's, so his methods may be independent."

Almost every advantage which Professor Beers here claims for the writer of the closet-drama is in reality a disadvantage. The more willingly a poet avails himself of these licenses, the more remote must the result be from the true drama, as Shakespeare and Molière conceived it, with their careful adjustment of their characters to the actors of their own companies and with their keen interest in the takings at the door. The poet stands revealed as a shrinking weakling when he wants to cast off the shackles that all the supreme dramatists have worn lightly. There seems to be a suggestion of wilful perversity in Byron and in Swinburne when they claim the stakes, although they have disdained to play the game according to the rules accepted unhesitatingly by Sophocles and Calderon, by Racine and Hugo. Professor Beers asserts that the aim of the closet-dramatist is other than that of the playwright and that his methods are independent; and in all fairness the conclusion ought to follow that his achievement is not drama, whatever else it may be. If the writers of the closet-drama choose to profit by all the privileges Professor Beers has granted to them,—as most of them have done in advance of his permission,—then they display themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as anarchists in art; and the result of their easy self-amusement presents itself as the product of unskilled labor, unwilling to learn the trade.

In the dedicatory epistle to his collected poems Swinburne tells us that, when he writes plays, "it is with a view to their being acted at the Globe, the Red Bull or the Blackfriars,"—the semi-mediæval playhouses with which the Elizabethan playwrights had to be content, since they knew no other, and to the conditions of which they carefully conformed their plays. And in discussing his own "Marino Faliero" Swinburne asserts that his dramatic poem, "hopelessly impossible as it is from the point of view of modern stagecraft, could hardly have been found too untheatrical, too utterly given over to thought without action, by the audience which endured and applauded Chapman's eloquence—the fervid and inexhaustible declamation which was offered and accepted as a substitute for study of character and interest of action, when his two finest plays, if plays they can be called, found favor with an incredibly intelligent and an inconceivably tolerant audience."

The first comment to be made upon this characteristic declaration is that we do not now know whether Chapman's plays did or did not find favor with Elizabethan playgoers; and the second is that these playgoers may have tolerated the eloquence and the declamation for the sake of the violently melodramatic plots which held the plays together. A third comment would be to deny incredible intelligence to the audiences of Chapman's time and place; M. Jusserand has made this plain; and no one is in a better position to know it than Mr. Swinburne himself after his devoted study of the Elizabethan dramatists. And a fourth would point out that eloquence belongs to the oration and not to the drama, and that the proper place for declamation is the platform and not the stage, which expects—and has a right to expect—the "interest of action" and the "study of character."

But there is really little need of comment, since Mr. Swinburne's sentence reveals a total inability to understand the drama as that has been understood by all the really dramatic poets from Sophocles to Ibsen, and by all the real dramatic critics from Aristotle to Lessing. It is true that Sidney, who had been infected by the sterile theoretic criticism of the Italian renascence, believed that the English dramatists ought to model themselves on the great Greeks; and yet Mr. Swinburne himself has never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found fault with Shakespeare for rejecting this advice and for adjusting his plays to the actual theatre of his own time, just as Æschylus and Sophocles had done in theirs and just as Hugo and Ibsen were to do. It is curious that Mr. Swinburne, whose adoration for Hugo is almost as perfervid as his admiration for Shakespeare, did not follow their example. Shakespeare was satisfied with the stage as he found it, semi-mediæval and unworthy of his genius as it may seem to us. Hugo, who had perhaps little more of the native dramaturgic gift than Mr. Swinburne himself, went to school to the professional playwrights whose melodramas were popular in his youth and absorbed their processes. The poet of "Hernani" was no closet-dramatist; his aim was that of the professional playwrights, and his methods were not independent of theirs. He took over the skeleton of melodramatic action which they had devised to please the multitude, and he flung over it the splendor of his lyric verse, with the result of evoking from Mr. Swinburne the assertion that he was a dramatist of "the race and lineage of Shakespeare."

It is curious also that Mr. Swinburne, in his study of French literature, has not observed that the foremost critics of France have never a good word for the closet-drama, perhaps because the closet-drama has never tempted the French poets, who have always contented themselves with the theatre as it happened to exist when they took up the art of the dramatist. Rostand has found his profit in writing for the stage as it is; and even Musset, who turned his back on it for a season, composed his poetic fantasies so closely in accord with its conditions that they needed very little modification when they were transferred from the library to the theatre.

In Great Britain and in the United States in the nineteenth century, while these closet-dramas were being published, there was no scarcity of actors capable of performing characters loftily conceived; and these actors were, many of them, eager for new parts worthy of their histrionic ability. And the continued popularity of Shakespeare's plays in the theatre proves also that there was no lack of audiences ready to welcome new poetic dramas, if only these novelties resembled the plays of Shakespeare in being dramatic as well as poetic. There is no reason to suppose that the poets of the English language would have failed in the playhouse any more than the poets of the French language failed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if these English poets had followed the example of Hugo and of Rostand and had taken the time and the trouble needful to master the methods of the contemporary theatre. But this is what they were not willing to do; they shrank from the toil; and therefore they cannot now claim the guerdon due only to that successful conquest of difficulty which sustains the masterpieces of every art. They chose the easier path, and they wrote poems in dialogue, devoid of the essential qualities of the drama, even if rich in the essential qualities of poetry. What right have they now to the same laurel we bestow on Hugo and on Rostand? They deliberately refused the test of performance by actors in a theatre and before an audience,—the final test which every true dramatic poet has accepted joyfully. It is almost as though they had composed music with no understanding of the several instruments which make up the modern orchestra, and with no intention that the composition should ever be heard. This may be legitimate, although we may suspect a blot in the 'scutcheon. There are no laws to forbid men from wasting their energies; but acts not illegal do not thereby deserve commendation.

It is a significant fact in the history of literature that the closet-drama has appeared only when there is a divorce between literature and the theatre. It is first seen in Rome under Nero, when the stage was given over to vulgar and violent spectacle; and so Seneca seems to have polished his plays solely for recitation by an elocutionist. It is visible again in Italy, when men of letters, enamored of the noble severity of Greek tragedy and of the artistic propriety of Latin comedy, despised the ruder sacred-representations and the lively but acrobatic comedy-of-masks, which were the only types of drama then popular on the stage; and they therefore attempted empty imitations of the classic dramatists with no regard to the conditions of the contemporary theatre. It emerges again in England early in the nineteenth century, when adaptations of Kotzebue, and later of Scribe and his cloud of collaborators, were the chief staple of the stage, and when the overwhelming vogue of the Waverley novels drew the attention of authors away from the drama to the novel, which was easier to write, easier to bring before the public and more likely to bring in an adequate reward. Behind every appearance of the closet-drama we can discover a latent contempt for the actual theatre, and a desire to claim its rewards

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without the trouble of mastering its methods or the risk of facing its perils.

This is why the closet-drama never appears in any period of affluent dramatic productivity, for then the poets who happen also to be dramatists are glad to study out the secrets of theatrical technic and to affront the dangers of actual performance. The closet-drama seems to be possible only when men of letters look down on the theatre of their own time. This was not the case in Athens when Æschylus and Sophocles and Euripides were producing plays in competition. It was not the case in Madrid when Lope de Vega and Calderon were vying in the effort to please the Spaniards. Nor was it the case in London when Marlowe and Shakespeare and Massinger were keeping the players supplied with plays which delighted the burly Elizabethans and which still delight us to-day. No more was it the case in Paris when Molière followed Corneille and preceded Racine, each of them giving the best he had to sustain and amuse his contemporaries.

Even if there was some slight excuse for the appearance of the closet-drama in Rome under Nero and in Italy during the Renascence, there was none for its revival in England in the nineteenth century, when actors and audiences were alike waiting to recognize and to reward a new dramatic poet. For its continued existence in the twentieth century there is still less excuse, since Ibsen has shown us how the austerest themes may be treated in the modern theatre. The poet of our time has no right now to despise the stage, where Shakespeare and Ibsen are gladly accepted; he has no right lazily to refuse to comply with its conditions, if he wishes to win its rewards. And it is the duty of criticism to withhold its complaisant approval. The drama is not for the library, but for the theatre; and it is not for the joy of the little group of dilettantes, but for the stimulation of the public as a whole. It was the wise Boileau who once said that, "Even when a work is approved by a small number of connoisseurs, if it is not filled with a certain pleasure for the general taste of men, it will never pass for good, and at the end the connoisseurs themselves will admit that they were at fault in giving it their approbation."

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRIEG: AN ESTIMATE.

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN.

It is a singular fact, for which one need not pretend to account, that in musical criticism (the youngest, most unreasoned and most unguided of the arts) one is seldom made aware that a distinction has been drawn between what Matthew Arnold liked to call the "real" and the "historic" estimates. Yet it is difficult to see how we can arrive at any just appraisal of music or of creative musicians unless this vital difference is held steadily before the mind. For example, it has been perfectly possible for modern critics, recognizing only the historic estimate, blithely to rank the admirable Haydn as a major symphonist; yet imagine—one need not say Arnold, but any sensitive and responsible critic of letters—ranking, for example, Pope as a major poet! Arnold, it will be recalled, in defining what he means by the "historic estimate" of poetry, observes: "the course of development of a nation's language, thought and poetry, is profoundly interesting; and by regarding a poet's work as a stage in this course of development we may easily bring ourselves to make it of more importance as poetry than in itself it really is": that is, we may fall easily into the error of mistaking the historic significance of the "*Chanson de Roland,*" or of the verse of Pope, or Dryden, for an essential significance which, as poetry, it does not possess. We may fall, through carelessness or indifference, into such an error; but we do not expect a deliberate and reasoned criticism of letters to exhibit carelessness or indifference: we do not expect it to fail of distinguishing between the artistic stature of Pope and Shelley, of Dryden and Keats. Yet how often does our musical criticism distinguish in its judgments between a purely historic estimate and a real estimate of Haydn, of much of Mozart, of the lesser Beethoven? The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason, it may be said again, is not germane to this discussion: the fact alone is pertinent.

Of Edvard Grieg, the most widely and sincerely popular music-maker since Mendelssohn, it would be easy to say that it is not now possible, since he has been dead less than a half-year, to form any historic estimate which should be in the least conclusive. The objection would not be a valid one: Grieg's relation to the past of musical art, to its development, to its present condition—even to its auguries of the future—is not in the least difficult to perceive. But it is, I conceive, far more interesting and rewarding to view his art in itself; to attempt to arrive at an estimate of its absolute, rather than its historic, significance.

Let us consider first, as a convenient point of approach, the claims which have been made for him, and the faults which have been charged against his art. The most persistent, and the most absurd, claim that has been advanced for him is that he was pre-eminent as an exponent of nationalism in music. It is a claim which is as negligible as it is unsubstantiated. We could still afford to ignore this aspect of his art even if it were not true, as Mr. Henry T. Finck, in his inimitable survey of Grieg's career and works, affirms, that instead of exclaiming over his music: "How delightfully Norwegian!" we should say: "How delightfully Griegian!" That Grieg, an ardent and uncompromising patriot, made much of his artistic allegiance to Norwegian soil is of little significance. As the French critic, Ernest Closson, wrote, "Grieg has so thoroughly identified himself with the musical spirit of his country that the *rôles* have become, as it were, reversed. His personality—a personality which in itself has nothing in common with the music of the people—seems to have become the prototype of this same music of the people; and the composers, his compatriots, imitate and copy him quite innocently in the belief that they are simply making use of local color." It is not intended to dispose too summarily or cavalierly of a principle which to a very large number of intelligences is of deep import; but it remains an indisputable fact that "nationalism" in music has never constituted a valid claim to creative eminence. Who are those in musical art who have been conspicuous as exponents of nationalism? Not Bach, not Beethoven, not Schubert, not Schumann, not Wagner, not Brahms, not Tschaikowsky; rather they have been minor prophets like Dvorák

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and certain of the Russians—those Liszt-sprung "barbarians" whose music is far more eloquent of the salon and the academy than of the forests and steppes. Therefore, one may be permitted, with all possible deference, to leave the question of Grieg's Scandinavianism to specialists in the discovery and exploitation of æsthetic patriotism, where it will be sure of adequate discussion.

Claims have been made for Grieg, upon the purely artistic side, which have done his fame a very positive harm. He was called "the greatest of living composers, with the possible exception of Saint-Saëns"—an amazing exception! It has been said that he "has created the latest harmonic atmosphere in music"; that he "is one of the most original geniuses in the musical world of the present or past"; that his songs, in melodic wealth, are surpassed only by Schubert's; that in "originality of harmony and modulation" he is surpassed only by Bach, Schubert, Chopin, Schumann, Wagner and Liszt; that in his orchestration he "ranks among the most fascinating." These claims have been deliberately and responsibly made, and they have been passionately defended; yet that they can have been seriously urged seems well-nigh incredible. It will be judicious to avoid, for the present, so parlous a question as that which is raised by the brave phrase, "the greatest living composer"; but as to "the latest harmonic atmosphere in music," Grieg's harmony, in comparison with that of Claude Debussy, sounds as comfortably unventuresome as do the naïve metres of Herrick beside the strange rhythms and subtle assonances of Mr. Yeats. As to the melodic wealth of his songs, do they surpass in this respect the songs of Schumann or of Franz? In "originality of harmony" does Grieg compare for a moment with Vincent d'Indy, with Richard Strauss, with Charles Martin Loeffler? As for his "fascinating orchestration," where does it stand in comparison with the gorgeously imaginative scoring of Rimsky-Korsakoff, the superb instrumentation of Strauss, the exquisite orchestral mastery of Debussy and Loeffler?—magicians beside whom Grieg, for all the delicacy and charm of his scoring, seems like a tentative amateur. Does the music of the Norwegian tone-poet deserve, is it helped by, such ruthless, wholesale, and inconsiderate praise?

On the other hand, let us see what certain of his detractors have found to urge against his art. The disapproval of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his critics has been most pithily summed up, perhaps, by Mr. Daniel Gregory Mason, who reproaches Grieg because, he holds, he "is never large or heroic"; because "he never wears the buskin." "He has neither the depth of passion nor the intellectual grasp needed to make music in the grand style." Probably of all his peculiarities, complains Mr. Mason, "the most significant is the shortness of his phrases and his manner of repeating them almost literally, displaced a little in pitch, but not otherwise altered. . . . His thoughts complete themselves quickly; they have little span, and they are combined, not by interfusion, but by juxtaposition. He never weaves a tapestry; he assembles a mosaic." Intricacy of design, largeness of span, synthetic power, are qualities to be recognized and applauded; but are they essential to a masterpiece? Have they, finally, anything to do with the matter? What innate superiority, *per se*, has "a broad-spanned arch of melody," a phrase of large sweep and wide scope, over a "short-breathed" phrase? Consider, for instance, that extremely familiar masterpiece-in-little, the dirge, "*Aase's Tod*," from the first "Peer Gynt" suite. "Short-breathed" in structure it undeniably is, wholly naïve in its contrivance; yet is it any less deeply and largely tragic, less fine and memorable, less admirable a masterpiece, for being so? What, in the end, have bulk and magnitude, intricacy and elaborateness of plan, to do with the case? Is it true, as a somewhat impatient appreciator of Grieg has lately affirmed, that artists who have carried their inspiration "through a long and arduous process of eloquent exposition" are necessarily to be more greatly honored than those who have completed their inspiration within a briefer flight? The contention has, beyond doubt, a deceptive force: a great epic seems, at first glance, obviously superior to a great lyric. There is Schubert's "*Erlkönig*," a superb song, of long flight, of broad scope; there is his "*Der Tod und das Mädchen*," also a superb song; but it is very short: it is only forty-three measures long, while the "*Erlkönig*" is one hundred and forty-eight measures long. Moreover, "*Der Tod und das Mädchen*," despite its sombre exaltation, is utterly simple in structure, while the "*Erlkönig*" is elaborate in form and rich in contrast. Or, take another instance: The E-major Intermezzo, opus 116 (No. 2), and the Third Symphony of Brahms are both authentic masterpieces; the first is among the most perfect of modern piano works in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the smaller forms, the second is one of the noblest of modern symphonies; in quality of inspiration there is nothing to choose between them. Is the symphony, then, by reason of superior bulk, a more eminent masterpiece? "There is no perfect lyric," Mr. Arthur Symons has finely and truly said—and the sentence is an answer to the question which has just been asked: "there is no perfect lyric which is made less great by the greatness of even a perfect drama."

The truth of the matter, as we must apply it in Grieg's case, is that it is not duration of inspiration, but quality of inspiration, which counts, and which somehow must be determined and appraised. Is Grieg's accent the accent of great music, of music of the first class; has it the accent, not necessarily of the few supreme masters, but of authentic inspiration? Has it any of the essential characteristics of the best music? One may, not too dogmatically, say that these essential characteristics are: ideas, individuality, imagination—I say nothing of "beauty," for that way lie inescapable pitfalls. By "ideas" one means definite and specific musical conceptions which persuade at once by their saliency, their eloquence, their distinction; and these concepts may be melodic, harmonic or rhythmic. "Individuality" and "imagination" are, of course, self-explanatory terms. To attempt to test all music by an application of these three touchstones would probably lead one, before long, into a critical quagmire; but they are of excellent service for purposes of classification. Let us say, for example, that in the music of Tschaikowsky we find extreme richness and fervor of imagination, vivid individuality, but not an abundance of distinguished or noble ideas; that in the music of his brilliant countryman, Rimsky-Korsakoff, we find extraordinary and audacious imagination, but little individuality and few ideas; that in the music of Saint-Saëns we find neither imagination, important and memorable ideas, nor vital and persuasive individuality (his technical expertness, his admirable craftsmanship, is a virtue which one takes for granted in a modern musician); that, to pass to the other extreme, we find, in the music of such men as Wagner and Beethoven, superlative ideas, puissant individuality, and boundless imagination. Now where, in this category, does Grieg belong? With the men whose supreme distinction lies in the transcendent quality of their ideas? or with the men of restless and flaming, or exquisite,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imagination? or with the men whose individuality is indubitable, but who lack salient and original ideas and richness of imagination—men of the stamp of Mendelssohn, Massenet, Puccini, Goldmark?

Let us say that Grieg possesses, in a measure, all of these excellences; but he possesses them in an unequal degree. He is sometimes truly imaginative, as in passages in the "Peer Gynt" suite, in the last two sonatas for violin and piano (opus 13 and opus 45), in certain of the piano pieces. He has, too, achieved ideas: ideas of exquisite distinction, of noble breadth. But they lack the stamp of supreme excellence; to resort to a literary analogy, his inspiration never attains to the kind of utter and perfect felicity which is represented, in poetic art, by such lines as these:

> **"The sunrise blooms and withers on the hill**
> **Like any hillflower; and the noblest troth**
> **Dies here to dust!"**

There is music—music by Wagner, by Brahms, by Debussy—which is as beautiful, as supremely felicitous, as these lines; but Grieg does not command it. He is often captivating and delicious, eloquent and impassioned—as in many of his lovely songs; there is free and vigorous spontaneity, an infectious vitality, in the violin sonatas; in the slow movement of the belovèd piano concerto there is an infinite sweetness, there is ravishing tenderness; in the dirge from the "Peer Gynt" music there is a quality of sadness and beauty which rebukes description. To praise such things as these is as necessary as it is delightful. Yet, as it has been said, they do not belong among the class of the very best, delectable and striking as they are.

But, in a surpassing degree, Grieg has individuality—individuality that is pervasive, indubitable. That, one feels, is his distinguishing possession. His accent is unmistakable. His speech may sway one, or it may not; but always the voice is the voice of Grieg. You recognize it at once; there is no mistaking it. He has, beyond denial, his own distinguishing way of saying things, his own idioms, his own mannerisms, if you will. You hear a phrase, say, from one of the lesser known sonatas for piano and violin, and you exclaim at once: "Grieg!" For the music is as redolent of him, and of none other, as, say,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"O cloud-pale eyelids, dream-dimmed eyes. . ."

is redolent of Mr. Yeats, or as the recorded vision:

"Fair as in the flesh she swims to me on tears"

is redolent of Mr. Meredith. The music of Grieg, when he is at his best, is drenched in personality, in individual color. It is curiously his own, curiously free from the reflection of other minds and other temperaments. In its earlier condition it reminds one at times of Chopin, of Schumann, of Mendelssohn, occasionally of Wagner; in its later stages it suggests no one but Grieg himself. Then, at such times, it is a rare voice that speaks, a voice of penetrating sweetness, a tender and vibrant voice, a voice of incomparable freshness and limpidity—no music-maker since Schubert has uttered tones so liquid and free, so spontaneous, unwearied and unworn. There have been others who spoke more entrancingly, more profoundly, more nobly, more subtly, with more importunate and commanding beauty; there are to-day, among those who but a short while ago were Grieg's contemporaries, music-makers who surpass this delectable lyrist in scope and vigor of imagination and fineness of thought. Yet Grieg is admirable in this: he wears no one's mantle; he borrows no man's speech. In his most characteristic outgivings—and he has produced little that is not charged to the brim with his own peculiar quality—there are no alien flavors. His wine is not the nectar of the gods of music, but it is from his own vineyard; there is none other like it.

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS RELIGION?

BY FRANK SARGENT HOFFMAN, PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN UNION COLLEGE.

No one at all acquainted with the tendencies of thought at present can fail to be impressed with the greatly increased interest now being taken in the study of religion. Thinkers of every shade of opinion upon other subjects are fast coming to recognize the fact that religion has always held a vitally important place in the development of every race and individual, and, whether we like it or not, is certain to remain a most potent factor in the civilization of the future.

For a number of years the most persistent efforts have been put forth by a small army of able investigators to find out the actual facts of man's religious life in all times and countries. Not only have the sacred books and rites of the nations of the earth been subjected to the most rigid scrutiny, but the folk-lore of all lands and even the crudest superstitions and most repulsive practices of savages have been carefully studied. Every possible means has been taken to discover what ideas man has had in all conditions of his existence concerning the powers that rule over this universe, and also to determine to what extent these ideas have affected his thought and life.

But nothing is more apparent in this awakened interest in the subject of religion than that the old view of what constitutes religion has undergone, in some respects at least, an actual revolution. The narrow sectarian position of a generation ago has been shown to be wholly untenable; and religion, instead of being the possible acquisition of a few, we now see reaches its roots deep down into the very subsoil of humanity, and cannot help giving itself some sort of expression, for good or for ill, in the experiences of every individual. Hence the chief inquiry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our time on this subject is not any longer whether a man has any religion, but whether the religion that he does have is of any real value; whether it is a help or a hindrance to his own progress and the ultimate triumph of truth and right.

But before this question can properly be taken into consideration, we must make a careful scrutiny of another, namely, what exactly is to be meant by religion? On this point there is still great confusion, and in the present state of the study of religion no need is more imperative than to have this confusion cleared away, or at least reduced to a minimum.

We may be greatly helped to the attainment of this end by observing in the first place that religion is not to be confounded with religions. Religion is that out of which different forms of religion grow or develop. It stands related to religions about as the first man stands related to the whole human race. It is the germ or principle which lies at the foundation of all religions and out of which they all proceed.

No error can be greater than to begin our present investigation with such a definition of religion as excludes by its very terms all other religions than the one that we ourselves most approve. This error is not an uncommon one among writers on the subject even in our own day. A distinguished Oxford professor, Sir Monier Monier-Williams, recently maintained that "a religion, in the proper sense of the word, must postulate the existence of one living and true God of infinite power, wisdom and love, the Creator and Designer and Preserver of all things visible and invisible," besides other doctrines which he specified. Then he proceeded to exclude at once Buddhism from the list of religions as "no religion at all." Manifestly, a definition of religion should have in it what is applicable to all forms of religion from the lowest to the highest, and not merely what is true only of one.

In the second place, religion should not be identified with a belief in the existence of superhuman spirits. We are not here concerned with the question as to whether the first known variety of religion actually took on this form. It may be admitted at once, however, that most of the religions now current in the world do make a great deal of this belief. But what we maintain is that if the belief should turn out to be unfounded, religion would not be destroyed thereby.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was formerly held that the wind is an immaterial spirit; that the sun, moon and stars are gods and goddesses, with their own separate ambitions and whims; that the tides ebb and flow, and that plants grow and decay in direct obedience to spiritual powers. But everybody at all acquainted with the physical science of to-day is, of course, well aware of the fact that no such supernatural beings exist, and that these objects and their activities are satisfactorily accounted for on quite other grounds.

The untutored savage, when he awakes from a dream, believes that he has been away on a journey, or that other people have visited him. But as he takes it for granted that his body does not make these excursions, he naturally concludes that his phantom or image makes them; and when he beholds his shadow on the ground or sees it reflected on still water, he naturally infers that his double self is following him about. But no psychologist of to-day would, of course, admit the validity of such an explanation for these or any similar mental states that might come within the range of human experience.

The realm of alleged superhuman spirits is constantly being lessened by modern research, and we have no way of telling at present where exactly this lessening process is going to end. Our point is that it is immaterial to our inquiry after the essential thing in religion as to where it does end. Many existing varieties of religion may have to go as many have gone already, but religion will remain. The doctrine of the existence or non-existence of superhuman spirits is not fundamental to its continuance.

One of the ablest advocates of this view of religion is Professor E. B. Tylor. In his "Primitive Culture" (Vol. I, pp. 424-5), after very properly insisting that the first requisite in a systematic study of the religions of primitive men is to lay down a rudimentary definition, he proceeds to criticise those generally in vogue. He finds the chief error of them all to consist in identifying religion with particular developments, rather than with the deeper motive which underlies them, and concludes by saying, "It seems best to fall back at once on this essential source, and simply to claim as a minimum definition of religion the belief in Spiritual Beings."

Now it is admitted that this belief may be a characteristic of all primitive religions; and, if we were merely treating of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history of religion, we might find this definition of much use. But we are looking for the germ or common principle of all religions, and that is something for which this conception of religion does not adequately suffice.

Again, we should not regard religion as primarily resting upon a belief in human immortality. Even so great a philosopher as Kant maintains that, "Without a belief in a future life no religion can be conceived to exist"; and John Fiske in his very helpful book, "Through Nature to God," asserts that the "belief in the unseen world in which human beings continue to exist after death" is essential to religion. Both these thinkers forget that the early Jewish religion was without such belief, and that in many religions where it does exist it forms no important part of either belief or practice. Among the ancient Greeks immortality meant the immortality of the family or state rather than that of the individual.

In many religions whole classes are formally excluded from it, and the doctrine is by no means universally held to-day. As Howerth well says in a recent article ("Interna. Jour. of Ethics," January, 1903, p. 190): "What has the conception of immortality to do with the religious philosophy of those who hold, with the late Professor Huxley, that religion is reverence and love for the ethical ideal, and the desire to realize that ideal in life? or with that of the philosopher Herbart, who considered sympathy with the universal dependence of men as the essential natural principle of religion?"

Important as this doctrine may be to some conceptions of the ultimate nature of the universe, religion would not perish if it should turn out to be erroneous. For what may happen in eternity cannot be the determining cause of the existence of a thing here and now. If the doctrine of conditional immortality, advocated by so many in our day, should become a general view, the universal acceptance of the doctrine would not annihilate religion. The idea of immortality cannot, therefore, be regarded as its final basis or ground.

Nor can we clear up this subject of religion by making it primarily dependent upon the belief in one personal God. This belief is, to be sure, the dominant form of thought on the subject of religion in all civilized lands, and that much must be admitted in its favor. But by holding to this as a satisfactory

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definition of religion we would exclude the vast majority of the human race from the category of religious beings. For many maintain that no primitive races have this idea, and the Buddhistic religion with its almost untold number of adherents teaches just the opposite doctrine. Of course we are not concerning ourselves with the truthfulness or the value of this belief. Our only contention now is that those who deny this doctrine do not destroy religion.

What man in history was ever more sincerely religious to the very core of his being than the philosopher Spinoza? His whole life was devoted to the advocacy of the doctrine that the only thing in this world worth striving for was to love and know God. "Our salvation," he says, "or blessedness, or liberty, consists in a constant, or eternal, love towards God." Yet he distinctly and deliberately rejected the personality of God as wholly out of harmony with a sound philosophy. Nature, or the World-Force, was the object of his reverence and love.

As a matter of fact, belief in the existence of many gods has been far more prevalent in the history of mankind than the belief in one. Suppose polytheism should ultimately prevail over all lands, or pantheism should become the universal doctrine. That would not do away with the existence of religion. It would only be changing its form of manifestation.

If the positions already taken are sound, we have gone far enough to see that religion in the truest and most profound sense of the term is not primarily dependent upon any specific set of beliefs. It does not rise and fall with these beliefs, or go out of existence if they cease to be. The greatest variety of beliefs have been held by the religious leaders of the world from Confucius and Zoroaster and Socrates down to our time and country, but few, if any, specific articles of belief are taught by them in common. No one of the creeds, even among Christians, is established beyond critical investigation, and many of them may yet be set aside or at least greatly modified by advancing thought.

E. Ritchie, after a very satisfactory discussion of the relation of creeds to religion in a late number of the "Philosophical Review" (January, 1901), clearly states the true position in these words: "We must conclude, then, that there is no particular belief as to what the ultimate reality of things is, or as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to man's relation to that reality, which is either essential to, or incompatible with, the possession of religion." This position does not imply, however, that religion has nothing at all to do with belief; for the opposite is true, as we shall see a little later.

Nor are we to find the ultimate ground of religion in some particular feeling or set of feelings. In the system of the famous theologian, Schleiermacher, religion was regarded as neither a knowing nor a doing, but a feeling; and it was made to rest fundamentally on "a feeling of absolute dependence." Several able, modern writers seem to hold this view, of whom Professor Lester H. Ward may be taken as an example. In an able article (in the "Interna. Jour. of Ethics," January, 1898), he says: "It is this sense of helplessness before the majesty of the environment which, if it is not religion itself, is the foundation upon which all religion is based." The error here is not in holding that religion has to do with feeling, but in maintaining that it is grounded primarily on feeling alone. For it is psychologically untrue to fact that any human feeling springs up of itself. It is always preceded by some act of knowing of at least some degree of clearness and force.

Finally, for the negative side of our inquiry, religion is not primarily a doing. It is not based alone upon the will. There are no acts the performing of which makes a man religious. Even "being good and doing good," though a good thing in itself, will not account for religion. Nor is it adequately defined as obedience to the commandments of God or as the subjection of our fallible wills to a higher will. All these positions contain an element of truth; but they do not lead us to the essence of religion as in the light of modern knowledge it ought to be considered. The apostle James was evidently not speaking of the ultimate foundations of religion, but of a local and temporal condition, when he made pure and undefiled religion to consist of this: "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

We must look for a satisfactory definition of religion, therefore, not to any specific belief, or kind of feeling, or set of voluntary acts, but to the whole of man as a knowing, feeling and willing being. We should not identify religion with any one of these three kinds of mental phenomena, but with them all. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psychology of to-day teaches that these phenomena in all probability never occur separately; that the unit of consciousness includes in some measure the activity of all three. Every act of perception is accompanied by a feeling, and every feeling by an act of will. Nor can the order of their occurrence be changed. Every volition is preceded by a feeling, and every feeling by some sensation or intellectual act. Pfleiderer is right when he insists that in every religious act the whole personality participates.

Hence a correct definition of religion must be determined by the way we put these three elements together. Our problem is a problem in psychology. It is not in the study of theology or ethnology, but of this science that we shall find the data for the proper solution of it. Religion exists because man exists. It grows up out of the normal development of his powers, and in trying to define it no basal element in his nature should be left out of account.

Religion shows itself just as soon as man has developed beyond the mere satisfaction of his animal appetites and begins to exercise his higher powers. There is a partial truth at least in Professor Ward's position that "religion is the substitute in the rational world for instinct in the subrational." No new-born babe or full-grown idiot has any religion, but every normally developed human being has. Whenever a man knows enough to distinguish the outside world from himself, and tries to act in accordance with this knowledge, he begins to be religious.

The first element, therefore, in religion is the recognition of the existence of a power not ourselves pervading the universe. And another is the endeavor to put ourselves in harmonious relation with this power. Of course the feeling or affective element is presupposed as coming in between the other two. For without it the endeavor would lack a motive, and could therefore have no existence whatsoever. Every sane man believes, at least, that he is only a fraction of the sum-total of things. He also feels some dependence upon this sum-total, and he is obliged to put himself in some sort of accord with it. This is what Caird has condensed into the statement, "A man's religion is the expression of his ultimate attitude to the universe" ("Evolution of Religion," Vol. I, p. 30).

Every growing man is continually changing in some degree

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his conception of the universe and the mysterious power that it manifests, but at no time in his career does he arrive at a final and completed conception of it. This is due, of course, to the fact that his experience is limited and can never be anything else. One of the greatest reflections upon a man's character in this age, when so much is being added to our knowledge of the universe, is that his views about religion never change.

Still, we must not forget that religion is a great permanent reality. It is not something that comes to-day and goes to-morrow. So long as man endures, it will endure; and as man advances it will grow in importance and power.

Here we need to note the fact that the permanence and reality of religion can never be affected in the least by the teachings of any science. For science is only one of man's imperfect ways of looking at his knowledge. It can never make or break any reality. Religion was in the world long before any of the sciences came into being, and it will stay here whatever may be their future development.

For science is a means to an end, and when the end is attained, when a perfect comprehension of the truth, such as we might suppose a god to possess, is arrived at, there will be no need of science. But so long as man remains finite, science will have a great deal to do with the various forms of religion that from time to time make their appearance in history. For it is the business of science to investigate and criticise all kinds of beliefs, and particularly all beliefs that are proposed for the acceptance of mankind concerning the nature and attributes of the supreme power that pervades the universe. Not infrequently science has had to combat with vigor such beliefs, for they have often been out of all accord with carefully ascertained truth.

At certain periods in the past the greatest enemy of religion has been theology, and in certain localities this is the case at present. For theology is almost always the last science to yield to the incoming of new truths. But whatever may be the teachings of theology or any other science, the essential thing in religion is not destroyed thereby. The germ is always present, and is growing with some degree of vigor and bearing some kind of fruit.

If the view of religion taken above be correct, we are led to the observation that every man is by nature religious, and unless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he twists his growth out of its normal course of development he will always remain so. Irreligion is not the state or condition of having no religion at all. It is rebellion against what one really believes to be the best religion, and the setting up of some inferior religion in its stead. Every sane man must have a god of some sort. He is so made that he must worship something. He must put something over and above himself and pay that something homage. Modern students of the subject of religion are now everywhere admitting the great truth contained in the statement of the ancient Psalmist that only a fool can say in his heart, "There is no God." They are willing to go much farther and accept without hesitation the recent assertion of President Eliot of Harvard, that the true test of any man's progress in civilization is his idea of God.

FRANK SARGENT HOFFMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DOGMA OF JOURNALISTIC INERRANCY.

BY MUNROE SMITH.

A YEAR or two ago a letter was printed on the first page of the New York "Sun" with the startling editorial head-line: "Right You Are; Wrong Were We." Those who read the letter discovered with a shade of disappointment that the mistake which the editor admitted was a trifling one: he had described a football as an "oblate spheroid." Still, his response made a grateful impression and lingered pleasantly in the memory; for admissions of editorial fallibility are most unusual, and the promptness, completeness and cheerfulness of this admission made it unique.

That newspapers rarely admit mistake is notorious. They are far from willing to correct statements of fact, and they are very unwilling to withdraw or modify expressions of editorial opinion. Many persons find this attitude unreasonable; some pronounce it absurd. Fundamentally, however, the policy of the newspapers is sound. It may even be shown to be necessary. It was not originally adopted because of any conviction that news was accurate and editorial opinion conclusive; on the contrary, it was forced upon the daily press by the inevitable inaccuracy of its news and the necessary inconclusiveness of its judgments.

News, of course, presents itself as matter of fact, but it is in reality only matter of impression. News of an occurrence reflects, at best, a one-sided superficial first view of a part of the facts which make up the occurrence. The difference between facts and news becomes most evident when we compare the methods by which facts are ascertained and those by which news is gathered. The most efficient agencies which the wit of man has devised for ascertaining facts are scientific investigation and judicial inquiry. Both agencies have found it necessary to develop special and highly technical processes and to take plenty of time—processes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which journalism could not employ if it would, and time which the journalist has not at his disposal.

A comparison between judicial inquiry and news-gathering is the more legitimate because the work of courts is in some respects akin to that of newspapers. Many matters which figure first as news become in time objects of judicial investigation. Courts disentangle their facts, as journals get their news, from testimony. Like news-gathering (and unlike scientific investigation) judicial inquiry is conducted under some limitation as regards time: except in police courts the work is not hurried, but controversies must be terminated and the calendar must be cleared. The methods of the news-gatherer, however, are very different from those employed by courts. The reporter, as a rule, hears but one side, and very little of the evidence on that side. He hears testimony which a court would exclude as irrelevant or misleading. He often relies wholly on hearsay. He does little if anything in the way of cross-questioning witnesses or determining their freedom from bias, and he seldom investigates their reputation for veracity. The crudity of his processes is attributable mainly to haste. Where courts have days or weeks, he has minutes or, at best, hours. The pace at which he must work is quickened by competition; for news is spoiled if a rival journal publishes it in an earlier edition. The correspondent labors under much the same difficulties as the local reporter, and has little more opportunity to test the statements which he transmits.

The difference between facts and news is increased, in many instances, by political or economic bias. A reporter hesitates to bring in matter which makes against the policy of his newspaper, and he is inclined so to color the matter which he does turn in as to render it acceptable.

The most important factor of variation, however, is the news-gatherer's duty to make a "story." This duty is not imposed upon him by arbitrary editorial policy; it is imposed upon the newspaper by the news-readers; and all that the editor decides is how far he shall go in meeting the public demand. Nor is the public desire for "true stories" a new desire created by the newspapers; it is as old as human society. Rumors about great people and great events, gossip and scandal about people of all sorts—these have always been demanded. And from the outset the gatherers and distributors of such news—village gossips, town

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barbers, travelling peddlers and strolling bards—have been constrained to put their news into artistic form; they have gained a hearing not because their stories were true, but because their news was always a story.

The news-story must, of course, maintain a close connection with the world of fact. News, no matter how fictitious, deals with real persons in real places, and is usually based on actual occurrences. Pure fiction is the younger rival of news; it tries to tell a better story by freeing itself wholly from the trammels of fact. In so doing it gains in artistic quality, but it loses something of verisimilitude. Even in pure fiction an illusion of reality is essential to enjoyment; and news, because it preserves a nominal connection with fact, retains the advantage of readier and stronger illusion.

It seems a far cry from village gossips and wandering story-tellers to the modern daily press, with its costly plants, its myriads of workers, its national and international organization; but, at bottom, modern journalism satisfies the same social demand with the same supply—rumor, scandal and gossip. Some of the more respectable newspapers limit their output of scandal; some of them refrain, except in the case of prominent people, from publishing gossip; a few endeavor to exclude unauthenticated rumors of the "interesting if true" type; but others cover the whole field and achieve thereby the largest sales. The modern daily press has unquestionably whetted the appetite for fiction that masquerades as fact, because it has made the supply as regular as that of our daily bread; and the demand that news shall be interesting has grown more urgent as the interest of news has been enhanced by increasing skill in its presentation. More strictly than ever before the news-gatherer is held to-day to the duty of making a story. If the occurrence which he has to describe is not interesting, he must supply interest. If the details do not group themselves dramatically, they must be regrouped. Omission or addition of incidents is governed, not by a desire to make the picture correct, but by the obligation to make it striking. To the journalism that gives freest play to the artistic impulse of imaginative reconstruction, we apply the term "sensational"; but it is not commonly realized that sensationalism is only an exaggeration of what we are accustomed to regard as legitimate journalistic practice, and that even in the most respectable news-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

papers there is a great and inevitable difference between facts and news.

Editorial comments are based on current news. If, as is commonly the case, the news is inaccurate, the comments are necessarily inconclusive. And the editor, like the reporter, works under the lash of timeliness. It is expected of him that he shall emit opinions promptly. The function of the leading article is to relieve readers who are mentally indolent and readers who are busy and therefore preoccupied—and nearly all readers fall into one or the other of these classes—from the task of forming their own opinions or finding fit expression for their own emotions. This function must obviously be discharged before the readers have either made up their minds or forgotten the news. Once in a while, a very conscientious editor, confronted with a very difficult or a very important question, announces that the newspaper prefers to reserve its judgment until fuller reports are obtained; but even such an editor is rarely able to wait until all the relevant facts are approximately established. To reserve judgment is, on the whole, injudicious. It not only disappoints the reader of the editorial page, but it tends to discredit the snap judgments presented in adjacent columns. Bismarck's aphorism seems here in point: that it is often less dangerous to do the wrong thing than to do nothing.

Under such conditions, editorial utterances, if not dictated by partisanship or other prepossessions, are more often reflections suggested by the current news than anything approaching judgments, and more often expressions of emotion than exhibitions of thought. The editor's safest course is to voice what seems likely to be the general feeling of his readers. The most dangerous course that he can follow is to try to formulate a judgment.

The legal view of news and of newspaper comment—a view that is entitled to consideration—is clearly reflected in the care with which, in criminal cases, all such matter is withheld from the jurors.

If the preceding analysis of the functions of daily journalism is substantially correct, the general policy of newspapers is evident. With facts as such, they have nothing to do. Statements of fact concern them only when the matter is timely and the form interesting. The great metropolitan newspaper should steadily roll off from its cylindrical presses its endless picture of daily life,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having less regard for truth of line and of color than for general effect; never looking backward except to point out that on such a date it published "exclusively" some interesting piece of news. On its editorial page it should record the thoughts suggested and the feelings excited by the news of the day; never reverting to its past utterances except to remind its readers that on such a date it expressed an opinion which fuller information has confirmed.

The course of conduct here outlined is that which the ablest newspapers regularly follow; and they would doubtless follow it without exception, were it not for a factor of disturbance which is practically constant—the letter to the editor.

By tradition, and in consonance with certain established (although disputable) theories regarding the relation of newspapers to the public, every individual who alleges misrepresentation or misjudgment of his acts or utterances has a right to a modest amount of space in which to present his grievance and to ask for redress. This right is akin to the commoner's right of petition in a monarchic or aristocratic state, and it is correspondingly sacred. Such letters, if they be not too long, must be printed; they must be printed with scrupulous exactness; and, as a rule, they must be answered.

These petitions the newspaper is bound to resent and to resist. They intrude belated facts. They call upon the journalist to turn aside from his business of publishing the news and making comments on the news, and to go into the inconsistent business of publishing facts and rendering judgments based upon facts. To cater to such demands would be bad journalism. To make the situation perfectly clear, let us imagine that the newspapers received every such petition in a friendly spirit; that they investigated every alleged grievance in a judicial temper and with an open mind; that if, on full consideration, it did not appear that any misrepresentation had been made or any misjudgment recorded, they announced this finding in such a manner as to inflict upon the unsuccessful petitioner the least possible pain; that if, on the contrary, the grievance were found to be real, they granted prompt and full redress, corrected the erroneous statement, modified or withdrew the misjudgment, and made the correction, modification or withdrawal as prominent as the original item or comment. What would be the result? Every newspaper would be deluged with petitions. To deal with them, the working force

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have to be increased and the paper itself enlarged. To discharge its new duties fully and conscientiously, every important newspaper would probably be forced to organize a second staff, composed of men not primarily interested in news but in facts—men of judicial temper and scientific training; and it would probably be found desirable to issue with the daily newspaper a supplementary fact-paper. In the fact columns of this supplement the reader would find corrections, first, of yesterday's news; second, of day-before-yesterday's news; and so on back for weeks, for months, and possibly for years, for in some instances no satisfactory approximation to the truth could be attained until years had elapsed. On the editorial page of this fact-paper would appear the sober second thoughts of the fact editors, touching the opinions expressed weeks, months or years before by their colleagues in the news department.

This fantastic picture of a journalistic house divided against itself is of value as a further illustration of the difference between news and facts. It shows that a serious and persistent pursuit of facts would carry the journalist into the field of the historian. The picture is of chief value, however, as a demonstration that the demands of individuals for the correction of misstatements or for the withdrawal of misjudgments are unreasonable demands, which the newspapers are compelled to resist. Any considerable concessions to these demands would be distinctly injurious to the essential interests of journalism. In theory, such concessions would be admired by all who praise truth and justice; in practice, they would gratify only the comparatively small number of persons whose wrongs were righted, and they would displease almost all other newspaper readers. Frequent corrections of yesterday's news would annoy the news-reader by compelling him to doubt the news of to-day. The illusion of reality might in the end be so weakened as to rob news of the only advantage which it possesses over other forms of imaginative literature. Nor would the reader of newspaper comment be pleased by frequent modifications or reversals of the editorial attitude. The average man does not care to appropriate tentative conclusions; he wishes, for the sake of mental tranquillity, to be provided with judgments that seem final. To lose confidence in his newspaper would drive him to formulate his own prejudices and to find reasons for defending them; and this would be irksome.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The illusion of reality as regards its news and the illusion of finality as regards its opinions constitute what is commonly called the "prestige" of a newspaper. The word is apt, for its original meaning is "illusion." In eighteenth-century English it was used in no other sense; Johnson defined "prestiges" as "illusions, impostures, juggling tricks." To-day the word has come to suggest something like reputation, but it does not mean reputation: it implies nothing more than successful appeal to the imagination. Reputation for accuracy of statements no newspaper possesses; for every one knows that news is not accurate, and that the only difference between reckless and cautious journalism is in the degree of inaccuracy. Reputation for soundness of judgment no newspaper possesses; for every moderately intelligent person knows that snap judgments cannot be uniformly wise. Popular illusion on this point is more persistent only because the readers of each newspaper share its views; they read it because it voices their prejudices; but for this very reason no general illusion obtains as to the wisdom of any particular paper. "Prestige" in these matters newspapers do possess in varying degrees; and the statement that "a newspaper must preserve its prestige" is axiomatic. The maintenance of illusions which are dear to the public and useful to the newspapers is a necessary aim of journalism; and the newspaper is bound to save what an Oriental would call its "face."

If it be admitted—and it is hard to see how it can be denied—that the petition for justice is a disturbing factor in the life of a newspaper, it must be conceded that sound journalistic policy demands that such disturbances be reduced to a minimum. It follows that the petition must be so answered that the petitioner shall not be likely to repeat his offence. No satisfaction is to be given him, for that would encourage him to write again as soon as any of his acts or utterances should again become an item of news or a subject of comment. Moreover, any satisfaction given him would encourage other aggrieved persons to write to the editor. It is clear, therefore, that, even if the petitioner happens to be in the right, he must be so answered as to be put in the wrong. This is not difficult to any practised disputant, and to an editor it is particularly easy. Both for the special purpose of putting the petitioner in the wrong and for the general and really essential purpose of withholding satisfaction, the editor has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means at his disposal which the ordinary disputant does not command. Not only has he the defensive position and the last word, but the attack is necessarily made on ground which he selects and with weapons which he furnishes. He decides in what part of his paper and in what type the letter shall be printed. If it contain arguments which seem convincing, or if it be so written as to appeal strongly to the sympathy of the public, he can print it in a part of the paper where few readers will notice it. He always puts it into the smallest type. He selects the heading for the letter, and is thus enabled to give a false impression of its contents to those who do not read it, and to bias the minds of those who do. The heading and the answer—if any other answer than the heading be deemed necessary—are printed in larger type, the heading usually in heavy-face type. This difference in type fitly symbolizes the fundamental advantage of the editorial position. The attack upon the paper is made by the weak individual "I"; the defence is conducted by the strong institutional "We." Were not vital interests of journalism at stake, the inequality of the contest might well move editors themselves to compassion.

To most American editors the denial of petitions for justice seems insufficient. They are clearly of the opinion that petitioners not only must receive no satisfaction, but should be punished for the attempt to interfere with the regular business of the newspaper. This attitude is intelligible, but it is not prudent. If the newspapers are adequately protected by making petitions fruitless —and this seems to be the case—it is unnecessary, and therefore impolitic, to give petitioners an additional grievance. Passive hopelessness should not be converted into active hatred. In any case, there is a choice among punishments; and it may be asserted with confidence that no form of punishment should be selected which tends to arouse sympathy for the petitioner. If it be deemed necessary to punish him at all, the safer course is to make him ridiculous.

The refusal of satisfaction is of course necessary; and this involves refusal to admit mistakes. This, in its turn, involves an assumption that mistakes are not made; and this assumption is the Doctrine of Journalistic Inerrancy. It is obviously a fiction; but, like many fictions of the law, it furnishes a convenient statement of a working rule. It formulates a policy based on expediency, and it admits such exceptions as expediency may require.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is well known that doctrines expressing policies tend to harden into dogmas presented as truths. With this tendency every student of government or of law or of religion is familiar. To this peril journalism also has succumbed. The Dogma of Journalistic Inerrancy converts a maxim of policy into a tenet of faith. It asserts that the newspaper is always right; and from this premise it deduces invariable rules of journalistic conduct. To show how this result has been reached, it is necessary to consider the manner in which the peculiar nature of journalistic activity, especially its preoccupation with first impressions to the exclusion of facts and with sentiment to the exclusion of judgment, reacts upon the minds of the journalists themselves.

Journalists of the highest mental type develop a philosophy which is by no means unknown outside of their profession. They hold that truth is not ascertainable, and that, if it could be ascertained, it would probably be valueless. Applied to journalistic problems this theory produces very convenient inferences. Since the facts which constitute an occurrence can never be fully ascertained, one view of the occurrence is presumably as good as another. The first impression may indeed be modified by a second, but the second in turn may be modified by a third; and in many cases, after long investigation, the first impression is re-established. As for editorial opinions, they are probably sounder and assuredly not less sound than other opinions. The only value of opinions, in any case, is the influence which they exercise upon conduct; and if an editorial opinion makes for desirable conduct, it is better than a more deliberate judgment which may have undesirable results. It follows that there is really no reason why any plausible statement should be corrected or any laudable opinion modified.

Among journalists of another and inferior mental type, a conviction develops that the news which they publish is fairly accurate, and that the views which they take are the only correct ones. The fact that their statements are seldom denied and their opinions seldom disputed, the ease with which the few who attempt to correct them are discomfited, the apologies and flatteries with which the experienced letter-writer approaches them—these things tend to create and to strengthen self-esteem. They forget that their comparative immunity from criticism is due to hopelessness, and that the deference shown them is evoked by fear.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The conviction of their own truthfulness and wisdom is of course most rapidly and most strongly developed among the most respectable journalists. The newspaper that is able to give thanks in public that it is not as other journals are—forgers of rumors, scandalmongers, "yellow"—develops a spiritual pride which darkens its judgment; and its relative accuracy and wisdom seem to it almost or altogether absolute.

Among all newspaper men the transformation of the doctrine of inerrancy into a dogma is furthered by constant association with one another, and by the resulting formation of a general journalistic opinion which is incomparably stronger and more uncompromising than is the opinion of any individual journalist. The same influences produce like results in all compact, like-minded social groups—in cliques and in parties, in faculties and in churches. Loyalty to the group makes the interests of the group paramount and converts the rules of conduct which subserve these interests into articles of faith. If one may invert Schiller's famous distich, the good cow which provides its attendants with butter becomes to them a goddess, gracious and holy.

Between the acceptance of the doctrine of inerrancy as a statement of policy, with clear consciousness that it is a fiction, and assent to the dogma, with conviction that it embodies a truth, many mental attitudes are conceivable; and it is probable that most newspaper men occupy intermediate positions; but the general conduct of the American daily press shows that the average editor stands much nearer to the dogmatic than to the rational point of view.

The dogmatic attitude reveals itself primarily in unbroken adherence to the rule that mistake is not to be conceded. It is only by journalists of the rational type that admission of error is ever made. Even from them such admissions come seldom, and the mistakes which they acknowledge are hardly ever of any importance.

The degree to which the dogmatic attitude has been substituted for the rational is reflected in the treatment of letter-writers who ask for an editorial correction or retraction. To journalists of the agnostic and indifferentist type, the aggrieved individual who forces his way into their columns is a fussy little man whose grievance is of no real consequence. Of course, no satisfaction is to be given him, but it is unnecessary to take him seriously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or to treat him very badly. Such journalists defend themselves with the weapons of wit and of humor, in the use of which they naturally excel. To the thoroughgoing dogmatist, on the other hand, the outsider who denies journalistic inerrancy is a miscreant, who is to be punished, not merely for the general purpose of repressing infidelity, but also because of his personal sin against the light. The journalist of the self-righteous type is peculiarly vindictive in his treatment of such offenders. What does it profit him that he is scrupulous beyond others, if he is to be reproved as are the publicans of the press? These journalists are not happy in the use of humor or of wit; for the humor of an earnest man is heavy and the wit of an angry man is blunt. Outsiders who question the opinions of an editor of this type in matters of any consequence are often treated with unwise brutality. They are trampled and gored by the Sacred Cow.

Dogmas are dangerous, not only to those who deny them, but also to those who accept them. Policy admits variations; dogma excludes them. Sound journalistic policy demands that the disturbance of newspaper business by petitions be reduced to a minimum; but the interests of journalism also require that petitions be occasionally submitted. Newspapers, like governments, are bound to do things that arouse resentment; resentment must have an outlet; and for newspapers, as for monarchic and oligarchic governments, the safest outlet is by petition. If petitions should cease, the public would clearly perceive that its right of petition had been nullified. It is for this reason that it seems unwise to inflict punishment on petitioners. The aim of punishment goes beyond the discouragement of offenders; it goes to the total repression of offences. It may, indeed, be said that the repressive aim of punishment is never fully realized; it may be urged that, for the sake of bringing to public attention the facts as they view them, some aggrieved persons will always brave certain ridicule and probable insult; but it must be recognized that the tendency of punishment is to reduce petitions below the minimum of safety to journalism itself.

The dogmatic attitude and the course of conduct which it dictates are directly dangerous to journalism by reason of the resentment which they arouse. In primitive social conditions those who insult and defame others incur bodily danger; and in some parts of our country the journalist is still exposed to private ven-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

geance. As civilization advances, the person who injures another by spoken, written or printed words is protected against violent reprisals; but this is not done for his sake, nor does the law which protects him represent any social solicitude for his life or limbs. The law is concerned solely with the maintenance of the peace. The persistent social attitude was clearly expressed by Franklin—himself a journalist—when he intimated that complete liberty of the press should logically be accompanied by complete liberty of the cudgel. The law has deprived the public of its cudgels, but in exchange it has given actions for defamation and prosecutions for libel. The check upon journalistic activity persists; it has simply assumed a new form. Journalists gain something by the change. The legal remedy is more costly in money and in time than the private vengeance which it replaces, and it is less certain in its operation. Moreover, the law is conservative; and new forms of insult, which in primitive society would have found redress by the cudgel, are only slowly met by an extension of the established legal remedies. But the advantages which journalism enjoys in the present stage of legal development are not necessarily permanent. More effective enforcement of the remedies which the law provides may be secured by associated effort. Societies might well be formed which for a moderate annual premium would insure their members against defamation. Able counsel would be retained; every grievance alleged by a member would be promptly investigated; and, whenever sufficient ground for action should be discovered, legal proceedings would be instituted and carried through at the cost of the society. Once formed, such organizations would probably extend their field of operations; they would become associations for the reform of the law. Doubtful cases would be brought before the courts in the hope of securing a judicial construction of the law more favorable to the protection of the individual reputation. Efforts would be made to obtain statutory changes of similar tendency. The laws of other countries would be examined, and it would be ascertained that in many respects these give more efficient protection against misrepresentation than is afforded by the laws now in force in our States. It would be found in particular that most foreign legislations do not require allegation and proof of pecuniary damage, but only of such misrepresentation as affects the reputation. In some legislations it is provided that, whenever a newspaper has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guilty of misrepresentation, it must publish the full text of the judgment in the same part of the paper and in the same size of type in which the original misrepresentation appeared. Statutes of this character would be demanded, and in the present state of public feeling such statutes might be passed. Encouraged by success, the protective associations might press for legislative recognition of the right of privacy; and they might secure the adoption of laws penalizing the publication of statements regarding private and family life, except in cases in which written authorization could be shown or a legitimate public interest demonstrated. In our States it is notoriously easy for an organized minority to secure almost any sort of legislation; and it is evident that the libel-insurance societies would take care that the new laws should not sleep in the statute-books.

It need hardly be pointed out that such laws, effectively enforced, would seriously interfere with the existing liberty of the press. Journals would still appear, but they would bear little resemblance to the American newspapers of the present day. They would rather resemble those staid journals of Continental Europe, which the American newspaper man has always derided for lack of enterprise and dearth of interesting news. Journalists there would be, but of a new and humdrum type. They would lack the glad freedom in the exercise of irresponsible power which now makes the career of the American newspaper man attractive.

To most American journalists the dangers here indicated will probably seem unreal. Accustomed to arousing resentment and skilled in making its outbursts appear ridiculous, they naturally underrate the forces which they are arraying against themselves. They forget that the misrepresented, weak as individuals, may become strong through organization. They do not appreciate that the irritation of the misrepresented is rapidly increasing, partly because grievances are never redressed, but chiefly because petitions for redress are so frequently dismissed with frivolity or with brutality. Least of all do they appreciate that the perilous course which they are following is due to a gradual change in their own mental attitude—to the elevation of the doctrine of journalistic inerrancy to the position of a dogma.

Gossips and scandalmongers have always been feared; bards were formerly feasted in the halls of heroes whose deeds they were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expected to celebrate, and welcomed in the courts of princes whose acts they might condemn; but the power of the modern daily press is, in its magnitude, a new thing. Like all new power, it is overconfident; it does not realize its limitations, foresee its perils, nor discern the policy which it should pursue to minimize or neutralize hostility. It might well learn something from the history of political power; and it might consider with especial profit some of the many wise things which Machiavelli says about the absolute prince.

The prince, Machiavelli argues, cannot safely be virtuous, for of the recognized virtues many would impede his career and some would destroy it. But, inasmuch as men praise virtue and censure vice, the prince should always seem virtuous. To this end, he should always claim for himself the moral qualities which as a rule he cannot display in his conduct. This, however, is not enough; he must occasionally do conspicuously virtuous acts. The occasions should be carefully selected, so that his good deeds shall involve the least possible sacrifice of political interest and make the greatest possible impression upon the public imagination.

Up to a certain point, newspapers instinctively follow the course which Machiavelli mapped out for the prince. They cannot be accurate, but they claim accuracy; they cannot render unbiased, deliberate and conclusive judgments, but they assert that their comments possess these qualities; they cannot deal justly with petitions for the redress of grievances, but they say that they are just. Obviously they should go further. In rejecting petitions, they should assume an appearance of fairness; and once in a while they should grant redress of a grievance, and grant it in such a manner as to make the act of justice especially striking. Once in a while a letter protesting against misrepresentation should be followed by the curt editorial statement: "The reporter who misled us has been discharged." More rarely, but still once in a while, a newspaper should relieve an individual from an aspersion cast upon him in its editorial comment; and, since he who gives quickly gives twice and he who gives cheerfully gives twentyfold, the aspersion should be retracted at the earliest possible moment and with the ungrudging alacrity of the "Sun's" confession: "Right You Are; Wrong Were We."

The dismissal of a reporter for misrepresentation is not wholly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without precedent; but the cases in which such action has been publicly announced are very rare. In such dismissals, undue consideration has possibly been given by some editors to the question of the reporter's culpability. Private dismissals, except for offences against the newspaper itself, and consideration of the reporter's culpability as regards outsiders are equally inconsistent with sound newspaper policy. A reporter who has turned in a good story should never be dismissed because his story is not true, but only because the interests of the newspaper require a vicarious sacrifice on the altar of justice; and, since such sacrifices are designed to allay resentment and to create a general illusion of journalistic truthfulness and justice, they should be made with the utmost publicity.

The prompt, undisguised and cheerful withdrawal of an editorial aspersion is probably without precedent. The editor who should first take such a step would doubtless be censured by almost all other journalists, but their opinions would not appear in print. In the public mind, the truthfulness and justice of his paper would be so securely established that subsequent rigorous adherence to normal journalistic policy would not seriously impair this new prestige for many years. Upon the advertising value of action so unusual it is unnecessary to insist.

A second editorial retraction could not produce the same sensation as the first, and repeated dismissals of reporters would also yield diminishing returns of illusion; but since such departures from established custom could never become common, they would never fail to produce the desired effect. An annual dismissal or a triennial retraction, if properly staged, would cause the murmurs of discontented thousands to pass unheeded.

These suggestions will doubtless be regarded as revolutionary, but they are in reality conservative. Occasional departures from the traditional policy not only will be of advantage to journalism, but are necessary for its safety. The Doctrine of Journalistic Inerrancy must of course be maintained, but the Dogma should be abandoned.

MUNROE SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CRISIS IN IRELAND.

A Word to the Irish-American.

BY T. W. ROLLESTON.

The national movement in Ireland has unquestionably received a severe setback since the present Government took office. I venture to think, however, that the untoward situation created by Mr. Birrell's abortive Bill may ultimately have a very beneficial effect if it awakens something of the critical spirit among Irishmen, and sets them, and sympathizers with Ireland, considering whether the means that have been adopted to gain the end of national self-government are really the best that can be devised, or are good for that object at all. It would be well if some of this spirit of wholesome self-criticism could be instilled into friends of the cause on both sides of the Atlantic; for, in the opinion of some very prominent Irish politicians, it seems more important what America thinks than what Ireland thinks. Without in the least adopting this position I may express my conviction that the key to the existing situation, or, rather, to the way out of it, does really lie very largely in the attitude which the Irish in America, and other American sympathizers with the cause, intend to adopt henceforward. I hope to justify this view later on. Meantime, let me ask any one who doubts whether the crisis that has arisen calls for any special searchings of heart to consider these simple facts. The main course of development followed by the British Empire has been towards the recognition of local liberties and local sentiment—in other words, towards the principle of Home Rule. We have at present in office the strongest Liberal Government that has ever existed; and most of its members, including the Premier and the Irish Secretary, are avowedly in favor of extending

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parliamentary Home Rule to Ireland. Yet that Government is absolutely unable to do so; and its position in this matter is recognized as so fundamentally justified and inevitable that the Irish Parliamentary Party go on voting its supplies, and associating themselves with it in the government of Ireland. The agitation which has led to this extraordinary situation has been carried on for a full generation and more, at an expenditure of some $100,000 a year, far the greater part of which is contributed from the United States. Can any one doubt that this situation calls imperatively for a reconsideration of the whole position? If the present movement, conducted by the present methods, has not put Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Mr. Birrell in a position to bring in a Home-Rule Bill with some prospect of success, what reasonable grounds are there for supposing that it will ever put any British Ministers in such a position? No one, I think, can deny that the experiment has been amply and fully tried. No one can deny the unqualified futility of the results. We are certainly under no illusions about this in Ireland. The "no far distant date" at which we have been so often told that our aspirations are to be crowned with success, has now become with us a kind of cynical jest. The political machine still runs along by its own impetus on the old lines, but it no longer attracts the young, the men of ideals, the men of intellectual enthusiasm. Nothing but the contributions from America keep it from following the natural fate of things that have had their day, and falling into dissolution in order to make room for something better.

Is there a something better before us, ready to take the place of this decaying movement? The adherents of the new Sinn Fein or "self-help" policy have a strong affirmative answer to give to this question, and their alternative programme to Parliamentarianism is now being debated wherever Irishmen are taking counsel over their country's needs. An article on Sinn-Feinism by one of its best-known adherents has lately appeared in this REVIEW. It is, no doubt, authoritative as an exposition of the principles of the movement, but I fear it is likely, not unnaturally, perhaps, to give a decidedly exaggerated impression of the actual achievements of the party to which its author belongs. The co-operative movement under Sir Horace Plunkett and the Gaelic movement under Dr. Douglas Hyde had been putting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sinn-Feinism into practice for years before what is now known as the Sinn Fein party was heard of. This party has done a good work in setting, as it were, the seal of advanced Nationalism on the self-help movement in industry and social reform. It has thus helped, or is helping, to break down the vicious tradition of the orthodox Parliamentarian Nationalists, who look with bitter hostility on every attempt to demonstrate that Ireland can do anything for her own progress and prosperity without the leave of the Legislature at Westminster. In this very marked feature of their policy, the Parliamentarians have, I think, taken a singularly bad measure of the needs and duties of the hour, and in fighting them on this ground the Sinn-Feiners are proving themselves a wholesome and progressive force in Ireland. But when we come to consider the elements which, as a distinct organization, the Sinn-Feiners have contributed or propose to contribute to the social and industrial advancement of the country, the display is meagre enough. A visionary scheme for establishing Irish Consuls in foreign cities, for creating an Irish mercantile marine (not by any means a work for politicians and journalists), and a comprehensive system of boycotting English goods, which, if it took real effect, would probably, by exciting a counter-movement, deprive Ireland of the best customer she has for her own output—these are all Sinn Fein has to suggest; and the suggestions, except perhaps the last, are not taken very seriously. Practically, it may be said, Sinn Fein must stand or fall by the one really salient and original feature of its programme—and that is a political feature—the withdrawal of the Irish representatives from the Imperial Parliament. Much will undoubtedly be heard of this proposal in the near future, and it is worth while considering it in its various bearings.

The proposal is put forward as having a kind of constitutional basis. It is argued that Ireland acquired a Charter of legislative independence when Grattan's Parliament was constituted in 1782; that this Charter was abrogated by illegitimate means when, eighteen years afterwards, it gave place to the Union; and that Ireland, in recognizing the Union, as she undoubtedly does by sending representatives to the Imperial Parliament, is acknowledging the validity of the Act of Union and renouncing her claims to be a sovereign State. The strong and dignified course is, then, to withdraw from Parliament and have no compromise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with English treachery. And this, it is urged, would also be the wise and practical course; for, instead of fixing Ireland's gaze on Westminster, and bidding her look for measures of redress from a hostile or ignorant body enormously outnumbering the Irish representatives, it would force the country to concentrate its mind on itself, and to bring original thought and enterprise to the solution of its own problems. No one can deny that there is an immense and as yet almost virgin field open to the organization of voluntary effort in Ireland under the British system of government—a system which, whatever its faults, certainly affords more freedom of private and voluntary action for public objects than any other in Europe, if not in the world. Then, when Ireland had practically taken Home Rule for herself, by the simple process of ignoring England, the time might come when, at some crisis such as that which arose in Austria-Hungary in the time of Deak, England might find it advisable to ratify the *fait accompli,* and acknowledge the constitution of 1782, which is represented as the minimum demand of Irish Nationalism.

Such is the programme of action which is running like a prairie fire among the young men who will shortly be shaping the policy of Ireland. Unless the Parliamentary movement can offer on its side a programme equally clear, honest and self-consistent, it seems to me that it must inevitably go down before its antagonist. Young Ireland is now educated as it never was before, and is learning to think. It will not be content with a flabby opportunism which talks separatism in America, Imperialism in Australia, agrarianism in Connaught and a self-reliant Nationalism nowhere. Parliamentarianism will be forced back on its first principles. It cannot afford to be nakedly opportunist and to scoff at principles any longer, as it did in the days when it had indeed enemies in Ireland, but no rivals.

We have set forth the fundamental principles of Sinn-Feinism. What principles, let us now ask, has Parliamentarianism to set over against them? In the first place, let me emphasize the fact that Sinn-Feinism is distinctly a policy of Separatism. Whatever merits or demerits may attach to Separatism must attach to Sinn-Feinism too, as the latter policy is at present understood. It is true that Separation is not formally included as an object of the movement in what may be called its articles of asso-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciation, but the status of 1782 distinctly is, and the leading representatives of the movement make no secret of the fact that their intentions do not stop there. Indeed, they cannot if they would; for the status of Grattan's Parliament is an inherently absurd and impossible one, as the English statesmen, who in 1782 so readily gave the Irish nation rope enough to hang itself, very clearly perceived. "Ireland a Sovereign State" is a very taking phrase for the kind of mind which is taken by phrases; but the moment one begins to think about it one is compelled to ask the question: What, then, is England to be? It cannot seriously be proposed to make England a subordinate State to Ireland. If not, then England must be another Sovereign State, and the question at once arises: How are we going to provide for the continued existence of two Sovereign States in one realm? In the United States this problem has been dealt with by the adoption of a written constitution, assigning its proper authority and jurisdiction to each local and to the Federal legislature, with, as a necessary corollary, a Supreme Court, independent of any legislature, to interpret and enforce this constitution. This Court is the only really sovereign body in the States. Even so, no one will claim that the system has worked quite satisfactorily; and the more America enters into relations of peace or of hostility with other World Powers, the more evident will be its defects. But in Britain there is no written constitution, there is no Supreme Court except Parliament; and, however the latter may delegate its power to this portion of the Empire or to that, it still retains absolute sovereignty over the whole. It may safely be affirmed that nothing except a cataclysm upsetting all plans and policies will ever cause that position of sovereignty to be relinquished, or set a written document between the will of the English people and their goal. The status known as Grattan's Parliament, then, which means two Sovereign States with no third power, save the sword, to define their respective spheres of action, would speedily be found to involve, as it did in Grattan's time, either separation or reconquest. It is quite clear that those who adopt this goal as Ireland's political ideal ought to have nothing to do with the Parliament at Westminster. They cannot, if they are honest men; and the other class of men are most unlikely to win the confidence of the country and to be the instruments of a nation's liberation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I call the Sinn Fein policy, then, a policy of Separatism, and I agree that the programme of the Sinn-Feiners is coherent and consistent with that end, though not with any other. Over against this we may set the policy of what is called Home Rule. Home Rule, I submit, does not differ from Separation in the fact that it goes a shorter distance on the same road. It goes on a wholly different road to a wholly different goal. Home Rule for Ireland—and let me add for England and Scotland—lies right on the main track of Imperial development, as it has gone forward since Edmund Burke first outlined the great conception of a confederation of free States owning the supremacy of a central Power, and a central Power regarding itself as the guardian of the liberties of these States, and basing its claim to their allegiance on the protection it guaranteed them in the development of their individual life. Home Rule, therefore, is strictly an Imperialistic policy—conceiving the Empire as statesmen like Burke and John Morley have conceived it. It makes for the consolidation of the Empire, for the fuller fulfilment of its yet unattained ideals; and it should be asked for distinctly on that ground. It is the very antithesis to Separation, and not, as I think it is sometimes taken to be, a sort of half-way house to it. And just as Separatism ought consistently to have no truck with Parliament or Imperial rule in any shape or form, so Home Rule ought to have no truck with Separatism. If, for any secondary object, it departs from this position, it so far becomes weak, inconsistent and, as a Home-Rule movement, ineffective.

It is not inconsistent for a Home-Ruler to go to the Imperial Parliament and to swear allegiance to the King, for if he is a genuine Home-Ruler he has no thought of ever casting off that allegiance. But it is absolutely inconsistent in him to come back to Ireland and to vituperate other people there because they, in their own way, have chosen to testify allegiance to the same King. This conduct has been systematically pursued by the Parliamentary party, and is beginning to excite disgust. One can respect a loyalist and one can respect a rebel. But a man or a party that puts on and off loyalty as a matter of party tactics, or to please an audience from whom contributions are solicited, is contemptible wherever honor and uprightness in public life are valued. Contributions! There is the real trouble, and there is the real hope. I wish earnestly to appeal to Irish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans, whose splendid generosity and fidelity have been so conspicuous in the history of the cause, to consider whether their very eagerness to help is not in part responsible for the situation of to-day. They have shifted the centre of gravity of the Irish movement from Ireland itself to another country. It cannot be good for any people to have their political work done for them at the expense of others. People who live in the United States cannot possibly, however great their sympathy, be in touch with the realities of Irish life. Yet they control the Irish situation, as the power of the purse always must. They can have no knowledge of most of the party whom they maintain; they have no personal responsibility, whether we win or lose on the lines they dictate. Why not leave the movement to those who have that knowledge and that responsibility, and whose lives and fortunes are bound up with the future of their native land? We have no need of American money—not a dollar of it. There was none forthcoming for O'Connell, but O'Connell maintained his long struggle, first for Emancipation, afterwards for Repeal, out of the resources of an Ireland much poorer than Ireland is at present. Ireland spends $70,000,000 a year on alcohol and $17,000,000 on tobacco. An infinitesimal sacrifice of these luxuries—not to say poisons!—would yield the $100,000 a year supposed to be necessary to carry on the struggle for our national existence. What justification, then, is there for laying the ends of the earth under periodic contributions for the furtherance of our cause? The only effect is to foster a class of politicians independent of the people whose aspirations they are supposed to represent, and to relieve that people of the wholesome necessity of thinking and acting for themselves. Only let Ireland's friends in America cease these contributions, and they will immediately force these politicians to turn to their own people, and to frame a policy which that people approve and which that people will follow. By so doing Ireland's American friends will brace and tone up the whole movement. They will make the situation as full of health and hope as it now is of discouragement and demoralization. They will put it at once on its proper basis: the centre of gravity will be restored to Ireland.

If there is any one who doubts where the centre of gravity now is, let him listen to a much more authoritative voice than mine. Two years ago, Mr. John Dillon went down to speak at Black-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rock, County Dublin, on the occasion of an impending municipal election. The election was to turn on the question whether an address of welcome should or should not be presented to the King on a visit which he was to make to Ireland that year. The Parliamentary Party, as every one knows, has denounced these addresses, and has adopted a resolution refusing to accept subscriptions from those who vote for them.* Mr. Dillon, in the course of his arguments against the proposed address, said:

"The National cause in Ireland could not live for one six months if it was deprived of the support of the Irish nation across the Atlantic; and if it were to go forth that we, who for the moment were trusted with the representation and the guardianship of the National cause and the honor of that cause, were tolerating the presentation of addresses to the English King coming to this country as King of this country, I say that the American Irish would turn from us in disgust and never again could we appeal to them to support a cause with which we were identified. Therefore, I say such proceedings tend to kill the National cause in America, and if the National cause is killed in America it will soon die in Ireland."†

I doubt if the most convinced and ardent supporter of the Parliamentary Party in all America can read that utterance without being startled. There, painted in bold colors, is the outcome of a generation of American control of the Irish movement. To such a pass has that movement come that the strongest man in it solemnly declares that it could not last six months if an aid on which it has not the slightest right to reckon were withdrawn. He actually elicited cheers by painting the National movement as a sickly imposture, and telling his hearers that it must not venture to have a mind of its own for fear of offending its paymasters. Is it any wonder that young men of intellect and character are, to use Mr. Dillon's phrase, turning in disgust from this kind of thing? They think that Mr. Dillon's views about the King do not come well from men with the oath of allegiance upon their lips, and they think that, if it were true that the National cause would collapse in six months without aid from oversea, it would have no right to exist for a week. What Blackrock thought of the matter is extremely significant.

* It is said, however, that the resolution in question is worked rather to promote subscription in America than to check them at home. The resolution is disregarded in Ireland, except when municipalities are under Sinn Fein influence.

† "Freeman's Journal," January 12th, 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Blackrock seems to have said to itself: If this is Nationalism, give us Unionism! When Mr. Dillon delivered his speech, there were fifteen Nationalists on the Municipal Council and nine Unionists. Four days afterwards, when the election had taken place, there were sixteen Unionists and eight Nationalists. And the Council has remained Unionist ever since.

What shape, it may be asked, is the Irish movement likely to take if, as I venture to urge, it were left to work itself out on Irish lines and on Irish soil?

Frankly, I do not know. There would be a period of wholesome strife, of the clash of opinion, of thought and criticism. All this would mean the stir of life where there is now torpor. In the end, we might get a genuine Separatist movement, or we might get a genuine Home-Rule movement. Either would be better for the country, materially and morally, than the unprincipled opportunism which (with increasing difficulty) holds the field to-day. Of one thing I feel sure, and I know in this I echo the opinion of very experienced and competent observers—that Home Rule, if we want it, is to be had for the asking, and could have been had almost any time during the past ten years. But we have never asked for it. We are not asking for Home Rule when we couple the request with a loud aside to our friends across the Atlantic: "Never mind! It is only to bamboozle John Bull; what we really want is the cause of Tone and Emmet. Only go on subscribing, and you shall see what you shall see!" John Bull is not deaf, and he hears these asides perfectly well; there are plenty of people who take care that he shall. It is really childish to suppose that he will grant his avowed enemies the power to stab him in the back. We had better take a leaf out of the book of that very valiant and very sensible people, the Boers. If we want Home Rule, we must ask for Home Rule and take all the honorable and logical implications of that position. We shall get it when we do that; we ought not to get it before.

Personally, I am a Home-Ruler, and I no more want to see my country cut loose from the British Empire than a citizen of New York wants to cut loose from the United States. Yet there is one feature of the Sinn Fein policy which, I consider, might, in a modified form, be adopted with great advantage by a Home-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rule party. It seems to me, indeed, one of the implications of the Home-Rule position that, while we ought to go to Parliament to demand Home Rule, we ought to ask for nothing else whatever but that. We ought to oppose, steadfastly and constantly, every Government that will not grant Home Rule. For no consideration whatever ought we to co-operate with it in the governing of Ireland. It is giving away our whole case to do so. Nor should we lose anything by this policy. There is not a great measure of our day—the Disestablishment of the Church, the Land Acts, the Local Government Act, the foundation of an Irish Department of Agriculture—which would not have been passed just as soon, if not sooner, although the Parliamentary Party had never existed. Agitation in Ireland, of one kind or another, produced them all, except the Local Government Act, which nobody demanded, in or out of Parliament. The record of useful measures which can fairly be attributed to a Parliamentary Party operating at Westminster is barren enough; but, if it were as fruitful as it is barren, it is still the wrong policy for the grand end in view—the winning of Home Rule.

I would plead, therefore, for a fair trial of a genuine Home-Rule movement. But, before any genuine Irish movement of any kind can establish itself, the subsidization of Irish parties from extra Irish sources must come to an end. The whole position hinges on that. Let Ireland's American friends send us no more money; it is only used to stifle original thought and to bolster up a policy which, on the confession of its own most prominent supporters, does not command the confidence of the country. Let them help with their generosity to fertilize the industrial field, to build schools, to endow colleges, to support the Gaelic League, to promote any non-controversial, non-political enterprise that pleases them; but let them contribute not another cent for politics, if they would see Ireland take herself seriously in hand, and address herself resolutely and effectively to the realization of her national destiny.

T. W. ROLLESTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMOR UNDER SUNDRY SKIES.

BY CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER.

THE reader may agree with the opinion expressed by a recent writer: "While we Americans can never have too much humor, we can hear too much about it." It is true the subject is old. Yet age cannot wither its fruitfulness: and we find it ever new, because of its infinite variety as we consider humor under sundry skies. The subtle, complex thing we are considering may be regarded as made up of that mental alertness and that sensitiveness of heart to incongruity which, thus compounded together, come to mean thinking in jest while feeling in earnest. If its composition be on this wise, there will inevitably be variation, not only according to degrees of earnestness, but also according to taste in jests and according to fertility of suggestiveness. In these respects, persons and races and ages seem somewhat to differ. Just how and why, are questions easier to ask than to answer.

In the first place, as to past ages we are a good deal in the dark. We cannot know all the causes that made the literary flavor of Titus Flavius Clemens, in the second century, to differ from that of Samuel L. Clemens in the twentieth. Nor can we now tell how much less witty, had he chosen so to indulge himself, might have been Bernard of Clairvaux than Bernard Shaw. Then, too, there must not be forgotten the distinction between the creative humor, on the one hand, which implies insight and originality, and, on the other, the appreciation thereof which implies, rather, quickness of sympathy. It is a pretty safe truism to say, in a general way, that the appreciative sense and the quality and characteristics of humor will vary in men by reason of race-temperament, history, and environment.

Nevertheless, beneath all differences is the essentially human quality, and therefore well-nigh universal prevalence, of the thing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself. We may assert that the Orientals must be without humor, because they are so solemn and so slow; and, lo! there are the "Arabian Nights"! We read the story of the Barmecide feast with its make-believe meats and drinks leading up to the feigned intoxication and the very real blows, or the story of the irrepressible Wag who took turns with his wife in being laid out as dead, or the story of the supposed corpse of the Humpback whom one after another thinks he must have killed: and these and other characteristic tales of the East show, we have to confess, their full share of drollest mirth and merriment.

The Greek mind and temper could not in this respect be lacking. It were enough to instance the political comedy of Aristophanes, or the subtle and paradoxical, but kindly, irony of Socrates, the mild glow of whose humor Xanthippe's shower could not quench nor the hour of death suffice to chill. In this regard, by comparison with the Greeks, there was a deficiency among the Romans, who were by nature legal and literal. The conquerors of the world, moreover, contracted a malady well-nigh fatal to humor, megalomania, a craze for bigness, which blinded their sense of proportion. Yet we have not only the polished wit of Horace, but also the broad, popular humor of Plautus and the tolerant and sympathetic humanity of Terence, who struck the key-note of genuine humor in his great line:

"Homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto,"

"I am a man, and nothing human do I deem foreign to me."

The sense of humanity was, later on, shut up within narrow confines. But, in the Middle Ages, some sense of humor found expression, and was kept alive, in the Mysteries or Miracle-plays, with their pantomimic and oral representations of Scripture stories and legends of the saints, and in the farcical pieces, Carnival plays, and the like forerunners of the modern drama.

The Renaissance, with its revival of the humanities and its humanism, was a re-birth of humor. After a long night, humanity awoke newly conscious of itself and open-eyed to the incongruities, contradictions, absurdities, and all the comedy of human existence. We have Rabelais, with his uproarious, riotous, roystering, rollicking tone throughout life, and at death leaving sealed his last will and testament in three articles: "I owe much. I possess nothing. All the rest I leave to the poor." The in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decency which defiled much of the humor of the Renaissance may be traced to the new sense of the conflict between man's spirit and his flesh. To that age belongs the kindly-earnest humor of Sir Thomas More; and in his house Erasmus penned the "Praise of Folly," which was dedicated to More and embodied his name in the Latin title, "*Moriæ Encomium*," a satire directed against the monks, but also against many abuses in that day.

As to modern nations, again we fall to generalizing. We say that the Northern peoples, with their feeling for the sombre and the grotesque, possess humor as a distinctive characteristic, and that the Southern nations of Latin descent are, of course, without it; when there confront us, in Italy, Boccaccio, and Pulci, and Goldoni, and Manzoni, and I know not what successors. Then we remember that Spain gave the world Don Quixote. The fantastic knight, gallantly tilting against windmills, is a figure at once ludicrous and also forever pathetic, as embodying the contrast between chivalrous dreams and sordid facts, romantic ideals and sober actualities, aspirations and achievements, the poetry and the prose of life.

Turning to France, there is Molière, there is the creator of "Gil Blas," there is, in our own time, "Tartarin of Tarascon." Yet to the Anglo-Saxon mind it is an axiom that the French lack humor. It were nearer truth to say that it is there, but we are not always in touch with it. The secret of a happy marriage, it has been said, is to have the same taste in jokes. When we deny humor to a people, it is more likely that they only have a different taste in jokes from ours. We may think, for example, that the present-day French jest is excessively exercised in the vulgar fractions of the Seventh Commandment. At all events, the French mind and the French tongue are uniquely fitted for the keen, neat thrusts of wit. In the general view of national characteristics from our standpoint, the typical Frenchman of to-day would seem to have more wit than humor, after the fashion of Voltaire, prince of wits.

On the other hand, for humor without any excessive alloy of wit, observe the German. Recently an American party were taking the train at Aachen. Paterfamilias was occupied with luggage. Madame, holding forth the tickets, approached the gate with anxious inquiries in labored German. The ticket-taker

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counted the tickets, as he received them, thus: "*Ein, zwei, drei, vier*—God save the King!" It was humor, sympathetic, but lacking the sharp sight to hit the bull's-eye—that is, to know John Bull and Brother Jonathan apart. Whether in books or comic papers, the humor of the Germans is rather ponderous, floundering about in their depths of thought, as it were that leviathan taking his pastime therein. This, of course, is true only of the North Germans. "Fliegende Blätter" is published in Munich. The Bavarians, and also the Austrians, have no lack of sprightliness. Nor must we forget Heine, who was Prussian by birth and education; but in race Heine was a Jew.

There is, perhaps, a like contrast between the Scottish humor, quiet, but rich with a strong and tender feeling of humanity, and that of the Irish, brilliant and scintillating, flashes of wit with a dash of pathos. The contrast here is accounted for by difference of stock. Let us turn now to variations due rather to change of environment, the change from English to American skies.

The long debate between the two sides of the Atlantic, as to humor, has exhibited a good deal of mere generalizing on the one side and on the other. Take a recent example. The grandson of a New York Jew wandered, fifty years ago, to California, and made himself famous by his graphic sketches of life on the Pacific coast in the period of the forty-niners. Now comes Mr. Chesterton, in one of his brilliant essays, declaring that Bret Harte was a genuine humorist, but that he was not an American humorist, and, as his reason for asserting that Bret Harte and American humor had nothing in particular to do with each other, declaring that "American humor is purely exaggerative." He must grant that Bret Harte was an American. Certainly his humor was American, at least as truly as Disraeli's statesmanship was English. But my questioning is of the generalization which makes a single adjective at once the description and the test of all American humor. "Purely exaggerative" is language not applicable to our earliest humorist, Washington Irving, nor to Oliver Wendell Holmes, nor to Lowell, nor to Charles Dudley Warner, nor to Mr. Dooley.

Some American humor, it must be granted, is characterized by exaggeration. It is largely a matter of environment. America is a new land, with a certain freedom in the atmosphere. Here

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humor might be expected to be exuberant and overflowing, with a tendency, sometimes, to extravagance. In a new country things go forward with a rapidity of movement unknown in more conservative societies, and not without its stimulating effect. Mr. Clemens, speaking once at a Hartford public school, said: "Boys, Methuselah lived nine hundred and sixty-nine years. But there was *nothing doing.* You in two years can do more than he ever did." The pace of living and the strangeness of conditions will vary with the newness of the community. New England humor and Western humor will be likely to differ accordingly.

It will be remembered that when that wit, William M. Travers, had removed to the Metropolis, and a friend said to him: "Travers, you stutter here in New York worse than you ever did in Baltimore," he replied: "B-b-b-igger C-c-city!" It may seem a reminiscence of this for me to suggest that American humor is often the humor of exaggeration on a bigger scale, so to speak, than elsewhere, because it's a bigger country. But the suggestion has, I believe, its truth. Bigness inspires exaggeration. For an example of American Geography, take this which I vaguely recall: "America is bounded on the North by the Aurora Borealis, on the East by the Precession of the Equinoxes, on the South by the Antipodes, and on the West by the Day of Judgment."

The eagle's wings are not always spread so wide. The humor, however, of so vast a country, whereof many parts are without the restraints of old associations and traditions, must often inevitably be large and elemental. The sense of humanity has free range. It finds nothing to shut it in:

> "Broad prairie rather, genial, level-lined,
> Fruitful and friendly for all human kind."

Those lines of Lowell, describing Lincoln, are suggestive of American humor at its best. Take away that sense of humanity, and the humor is not at its best. Here lies the possibility of deterioration. There is a flavor of its own in Artemus Ward's whim, when in Salt Lake City, to print his tickets: "Admit bearer with one wife." We enjoy the gentle thrust at polygamy. Enjoyable also is a degree of the grotesquely grim, as in the showman's admission that, in the famous "Happy Family," there was necessary an occasional renewal of the lamb. It is, however, easy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to see that, under conditions of newness, a humor utterly unconventional and unrestrained might be often crude and rude, and sometimes degenerate into a buffoonery which, lacking that deeper quality of humanity to be felt in the greatest humor, were fitly to be described as horse-play. When humor has become flippant, that is to say, is quite without a background, however hidden in shadow, of earnest reverence for and sympathy with what is human, and consists in a cheap sort of would-be wit which aims only at raising a laugh, a shallow-hearted and cynical laugh, by merely turning things upside down and comically caricaturing humanity; then you have the counterfeit humor of the circus clown. Am I wrong in fearing that, when multitudes have been making their Sunday meditation on The Yellow Kid and his kind, there is danger that in the popular mind humor may be lowered, cheapened and degraded?

Turning to England, we have really two questions. First, have the English a sense of humor? Second, is there a distinctively English humor? It is often said that the English are without a sense of humor. I am far from being an Anglomaniac, but I beg to question so wide a generalization. In the words of Burke, "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people."

The English, less analytical than the French, caring less for clean cleavages of thought, would be likely to be less witty. The English temper of mind is more literal, with less imagination and self-questioning, than the American. There are, I fancy, more English than Americans without a keen sense of humor. But the lack of humor anywhere is sure to cause a supply to meet the vacuity. One thinks with envy of the unfailing joy the English parson has who occupies that pulpit, a memorial pulpit, whereon has been carved: "For so He giveth His beloved sleep." The English are more practical, perhaps less accessible to a strange idea. They do sometimes show a tardiness in meeting our jokes half-way. As has been said, "Procrastination is the thief of wit, as well as of time." A certain kind of imaginative humor the English do not seem quick to appreciate. Nor are they very quick to enter into its meaning. Undoubtedly that humor of exaggeration is by no means always to their taste. It is too crude and too strong. They cannot swallow it. But one who may not be equal to an undiluted draught of our Western

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liquor may yet have a fondness for old English ale. The popularity, too, among the English of Irving, Lowell, Bret Harte, Mr. Dooley, shows they can appreciate some American humor. Their appreciation of their own we may infer when we read of certain of the most distinguished men of the nation rolling on the floor at the Rev. Mr. Brookfield's jests.

The generalization above referred to is disposed of, if there be among the English a genuine humor. Take, for instance, that clergyman who was a lecturer at Oxford and author of treatises on the higher mathematics. It was, nevertheless, he who gave us Alice and the Hatter and the grin without the cat, and all those droll surprises and illusive mockeries of Dreamland. But last year's Westminster Play, with its epilogue, may constitute a sufficient defence of England on this score.

The case between England and America in this regard is, I fancy, somewhat as it is in other respects. In America there is, perhaps, a better general average of education; but in England there are more scholars of ripest culture. So humor may be, as Mr. Bryce declares, a general characteristic of the American people, and perhaps for the reason that, amid new and unprecedented conditions, there is more to strike upon and to develop the sense of strangeness and incongruity. In England, humor may be less general. What there is, however, would be likely to be less crude, to depend for its make-up less upon the droll or merely queer, and more upon the element of the humane. Thus we might expect to have, speaking generally, a truer, or let us say, in the literary aspect, a higher, humor, of choicer quality, so far forth as it is a product of the ancient vintage and rich fruitage of an immemorial society and historic scenes.

It is largely a matter of soil and atmosphere, of sources and surroundings. Imagine Charles Lamb in Roaring Camp! He pre-eminently belongs to his environment,—"the Temple, its church, its halls, its gardens, its fountain," the Thames, the "motley Strand," the quaint associations of old London. The result we know. That stammering tongue giving utterance to a nimble wit instinct with and inspired by humor. Said Coleridge: "Charles, did you ever hear me preach?" "I never heard you do anything else!" Or, again, "Wordsworth says he could have written 'Hamlet' if he'd had the *mind*." And the humor of Elia, its charm and spell! That exquisite prose, pervaded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by a subtle fragrance and flavor, how delicate, how mellow, as of some old wine that makes glad the heart!

English humor, we may not forget, is largely in books. Whiskey, I have been told, gets a desirable quality from being stored in wood. American humor may have gained a certain mellowing when it shall have been longer in literature. Those English books, however, represent the survival of the fittest. Of some of our American humor I question, Will it live? How rich is English literature in humor that is immortal! Think of the story-teller of Samoa; of Thomas Hardy; of George Eliot; of Thackeray, maligned as cynical; of Dickens, intellectually inferior to Thackeray, but still gifted with the genuine humor which comes of feeling for and with humanity; or of his literary forebears, Smollet and Fielding! It is a joy even to tell over the names — Sydney Smith, Scott, Jane Austen and Goldsmith, Addison and Steele, old racy Bunyan. Besides Chaucer, other ancient wells and springs of "English undefyled" show traces of salt. Then we have Falstaff, Touchstone, Sir Toby, Malvolio, the Clown, Dogberry, Launce with his dog, Bottom, and Puck confessing:

> ". . . those things do best please me
> That befall preposterously";

and King Lear's faithful Fool,

> ". . . who labors to outjest
> His heart-strook injuries";

And, behind that broad stage, like his Prospero, the master magician himself, his personality, wrapt in impenetrable reticence, a perpetual puzzle,

> "We ask and ask—Thou smilest and art still."

When all is said, we are not sure whether humor is to be defined as a quality of mind and heart, or as an attitude taken toward life's mishaps and surprises. However elusive of definition and howsoever variable in its manifestations, it is felt as gladly as sunshine in winter, and it is appreciated the more as it is missed. To miss it in a person is to discover a well-nigh fatal lack. To charge one with the lack is something to be resented nor soon forgiven. There is hardly any one who would not be willing to say: Though I speak with the tongue of orators and of poets and have not humor, I am nothing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is, I am persuaded, a right instinct which regards humor as something to treasure and be thankful for. It will often save a man from making an ass of himself or a mule. With its sense of relation and proportion, it serves as a kind of balance-wheel. It is a safeguard against excess and a secret of poise. It will often furnish the test as to whether a man masters his work or his work him. In this workaday world it is a lubricant to save from friction, and a protection against much of the wear and tear. Nay, more, it is a flavor that adds a zest to life's appetite and enjoyment. It is not without its virtues as a preventive of premature age, furthering, as it does, a joyous adjustment to environment that keeps one young. Lowell, one day passing an institution with the sign "For Incurable Children," exclaimed: "There is where I belong!" At least, humor lets one hear the plashing of the fountain of youth, and carry the music in his heart for many a day.

It is conservative of friendship, for what might become unpleasant or tragic it postpones till some other day. Indeed, again and again its bright beams have transmuted a rain of tears into the bow of hope and promise. Humor serves as an antiseptic to preserve not only one's interest in living, but, moreover, one's patience and good temper and fellow-feeling with others. It is an illumination helping one to move among men with kindlier eyes and warmer heart; and to go through life with a larger vision that, even in fog and in the dark, keeps brave lookout for the better, not the worse, trusting somehow to come at "good in everything."

CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE YOSEMITE WATERS.

BY HARRIET MONROE.

THE beauty of falling waters is like the beauty of birds—delicate, musical, swift of flight and brilliant with many colors. It is like the fragile, laboriously wrought beauty of lace, weaving fantastic patterns out of invisible threads. Like the soft white beauty of snow it is, flaking, drifting, draping the rocks, turning to blue and green and lilac in the sparkle of the sun. It is like the beauty of armies—yes, like the beauty of armies is the beauty of falling waters, of armies that march to victory, shouting and waving banners, and booming their haughty guns. It is like the beauty of the will of God—joyous, not to be questioned, working for its own.

And falling waters have many souls, and none shall gainsay the least of them. Souls of laughing and of weeping have they, of motion and of rest; souls that cry out and others that are still.

Like a flower is the soul of Bridal Veil, like a white lily nodding in the wind. Now the north wind finds her, and tenderly, appealingly, she leans as for succor unto the granite wall; now the south wind seeks her, and she spreads out her filmy robes like a dancer and strews the air with her whiteness. Lovely she is, and her voice is soft, and her breath is sweet and fine like the faint scent of azaleas. With light touches she strokes the mountain and he gives her of himself; yet, though he woo her for a million years, for him she will never change.

And Illilouette flutters like a ribbon in the wind as she picks her difficult way over the steep black rocks. Glad she is with the gladness of a child, careless of danger, waving her hand in the sun. I see the gleam of her teeth as she laughs; I see her slim white limbs and the ripple of her long bright hair. She runs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with swift feet; she pauses not; she wins her way to her playfellow, the river, who lifts her daintily over the rocks and carries her far, far, through the resisting mountains.

And Yosemite is a poet in a dream, a poet questioning the sky. Tall as a moonbeam, slim as a reed, swayed to and fro by the drift of his dream, he poises light white feet on the heavy earth and crowns his brow with the blue. His dream is of all beautiful things; of moony nights and flowers a-film with dew, of rainbows that sparkle with many colors, of the blue-veined arms of happy maids; even of the beauty of sadness dreams he, of lovers separated forever, of death hushing the voices of little children. Always in his house of light and mist he listens and sings and sighs, and holds the secret in his heart; that none may dream his dream, nor tell his tale of the beauty of it.

And Nevada, haughty Nevada, is a warrior queen whose soul love takes unaware. She goes forth armed for battle; of silver is her breastplate, of silver and jewels her helmet, and her right hand carries a spear. But suddenly she hears a voice and turns; she gazes, and the heart of her is changed. She catches up filmy draperies and robes herself like a bride; she shouts with new joy, she leaps to her cataract lover on the path of the winds. And down in his green gorge he clasps her close and bears her singing onward. Stern and tall and straight is Vernal, her shining round-armed lover; robed in whitest sparkle of white, beautiful and strong. In him the soul of falling waters is a hero, proud of his triumph. He heaps up Happy Isles for his beloved, and films their flowers with his breath. He hews out the earth to build them; he hurls the rocks from his path and commands the mountain to make way. And all the immovable things hearken and obey, for the will of falling waters none shall gainsay.

They have carved the mountains, these soft caressing fingers of falling waters, these delicate foamy touches on the stubborn rock.

They have carved the mountains and cut them through with gorges, and adorned them with rich embroideries of green. For them El Capitan rears his snow-white head to the sun; for them Dome and Half-dome pillar the sky. For them the great sequoias gather the years together on the valley floor and shake their lofty heads at time. For them the pink azaleas pattern the woods

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in June and all the little mountain flowers dip their brows in dew.

Beautiful as love in its hope is the beauty of falling waters; strong as love in its triumph is their strength. They wait and sparkle and are still—as light as thistle-down, as soft as air. They gather the plumes of an hundred battles, they sweep on with the passion of peopled worlds. And life is a bubble in the foam of them; it shall burst in the sun and vanish, and the beauty of falling waters shall reck not that it is gone.

HARRIET MONROE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY JAMES HUNEKER, HENRY T. FINCK, EDWARD PORRITT, A NAVAL OBSERVER AND JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

GEORGE SAND.*

THE newest book about George Sand is by an English writer, Francis Gribble, and is baldly entitled "George Sand and Her Lovers." A few years ago such a head-line could hardly have been possible in England, nor can we altogether admire its taste. George was a maternal nymphomaniac, yet the most interesting part of her was not her lovers. We hold no brief for or against her conduct. She was the victim of circumstances at the beginning. She craved notoriety later on. At times she acted as if she were the self-elected avenger of man's inhumanity to woman. That she was the impassioned creature the world believed her to be, or that she believed herself to be, we beg to doubt. Dumas even denies to her much temperament. Cerebral she always was, too often morbid and curious—and avid as to the matter of *copy!* It must not be forgotten that she was a sphinx of the inkwell. She worked like a master builder for four decades, worked when she was happy and unhappy. She was the first female journalist—using the word in a broad sense. Everything she suffered or enjoyed she later turned into printed matter, and it is not difficult to realize that once the habit had crystallized, once the sixth sense, the news sense, had become vitalized, she went along the broad and primrose path setting off the pyrotechnics of passion. She speared many victims with her Bengal lights and silken phrases, and whenever a new novel of hers appeared the Boulevard asked: "Who's the man now?" She changed her lovers almost annually.

* "George Sand and Her Lovers." By Francis Gribble. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Gribble's book contains little that is new. It is a string of readable, very readable, gossipy anecdotes and not the portrait of an extraordinary woman. You may find that portrait, with literary criticism added, in Caro's monograph, and in Samuel Rocheblave's "George Sand et La Fille" (Calmann-Levy, Publisher). Nearly all the new things about the quarrel of Solange Sand with her mother M. Rocheblave has already told us, and he was the first to print the recently discovered correspondence, slight as it is, between Chopin and Solange—who had incurred her mother's wrath by marrying the sculptor Clésinger, a man of Bohemian habits. Chopin sided with Solange in the row, and this was one of the reasons, the chief one, possibly, that caused George's rupture with the Polish composer. And all this I have told in my biography of Chopin, years ago; told of George Sand boxing her son-in-law's ears, and of the literary partnership later formed between "Soli" and the Marquis Alfieri, the nephew of the great Italian poet. Solange held a Salon in Paris, where came Gambetta, Jules Ferry, Floquet, Taine, Herve, Henri Fouquier, Weiss the critic—who described her, and he of all men could describe her, as having the "curved Hebraic nose of her mother and hair coal black." She died in 1899 at Nahant, her mother's house. Maurice Sand, the son, died in 1883. But these things Mr. Gribble does not tell, and despite the title of his book he by no means furnishes a complete account—who could!—of the lovers of George Sand. He speaks of Sandeau, de Musset, Dr. Pagello, the disappointed Venetian lover, Michel de Bourges, Felicien Mallefille, Pierre Leroux, Chopin, Prosper Mérimée—this is not the chronological order—Manceau, and the platonic friendship with Flaubert. But where is that sly old voluptuary Sainte-Beuve, Franz Liszt—who was her lover notwithstanding denials; George confessed herself that "le petit *Litz* was fonder of praying to the Virgin than of her"—and Delacroix, Dumas, and Calmatta the mezzotinter, and the pianist Hermann? "Puzzi" was his nickname; later he became a discalced Carmelite friar. Are these all? Who dare say? That she killed de Musset we doubt; absinthe helped matters along, and his illness in Venice turns out to have been delirium tremens. Chopin was a consumptive, and here the case looks ominous. Yet he survived by several years the separation. That she threw him overboard as she threw de Musset there can be no doubt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liszt she could not enslave, and after a week she parted with Mérimée by mutual consent. Each loathed the other. Stendhal made merry of the affair in his usual brutal, subtle style. The sanest friendship she ever had was with Flaubert—their correspondence proves it — and her influence on the old grumbling giant of Croisset was healthy. In her mature years Madame Sand—who was born in 1804 and called Lucile-Aurore Dupin, descending from a choice chain of illegitimate rowdy and demi-royal ancestors—became optimistic, matronly and proper. She was the cheerful milch cow for her children. It is assisting at a delicious comedy to read her warnings to her son Maurice about actresses. She tells in her memoirs of Sarah Bernhardt trying to poison herself. "I spoke to her," says George, in her most maternal manner, "of her son and of the love and care she owed him. . . . Sarah burst into tears and sobbed aloud. She assured me that she was horrified at the life she had led . . . etc. A few days afterwards, coming late to the theatre, I passed on the staircase Sarah Bernhardt and her sister Jeannie on their way to the Bal Bullier in male costume. . . . Beware of women of the theatre." Precisely. It is the warning of the *Cabotine* who had reformed to the *Cabotine* who had not. And was Manceau dead at this time? But Madame Sarah says nothing of all this in her newly published memoirs. The old guard surrenders but never dies!

Sand was not beautiful. Edouard Grenier says that she was short and stout. "Her eyes were wonderful, but a little too close together." Do you remember Heine's description: "Femme avec l'œil sombre"? Black they were, these eyes, and they reminded Grenier at once of unpolished marble and of velvet. "Her nose was thick and not overshapely. Her mouth was rather coarse and her chin small. She spoke with great simplicity, and her manners were very quiet." With this rather negative physical apparatus she conquered men like a Napoleon in petticoats. Even prim old Thiers tried to kiss her, and her indignation was epical. He giggled in a silly way when reproved. It seems incredible. Do you recall the Bonnat portrait of the statesman? Chopin at first disliked George Sand—by the way, it should be said that Gribble's account of the Chopin *liaison* is imperfect. Liszt was never wholly won. Mérimée despised her in his frigid fashion. Michel de Bourges treated her roughly. Poor Alfred de

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Musset, alone, seemed to have loved her romantically and to the last. What was the attraction? She had brains and magnetism. That she loved all her lovers is impossible, though she is a fine object-lesson for those who maintain that women are polyandrous. The truth is that she suffered at first severely, and being an artist shrewdly made of her suffering a literary asset. That she had an operative conscience we do not know beyond the inescapable fact that she preached—oh! how she preached!—morality in her later stories. Compared with the feminine fiction of to-day Sand's is almost idyllic. But she is its ancestor. She acted in life what so many latter-day ladies urge others to do—and never attempt themselves. Brave George!

The Sandeau episode was only an episode. She emerged from it carrying away half of his name, but not his heart. Mr. Gribble does not relate the anecdote in its entirety, the one told by Jules Clarétie. Here is the true version of this particular affair. In 1870, when Madame Sand was an old woman, full of honors, she went one day to visit the Minister of Instruction. There, being detained in the antechamber, she fell into a pleasant conversation with a well-groomed old gentleman who wore the rosette of the Legion of Honor. After ten minutes' chat the unknown consulted his watch, arose, and then bowed to Madame Sand.

"If I could always find such a charming companion I would visit the Ministry often," he gallantly said, and went away. The novelist called an attendant. "Who is that amiable old gentleman?" she asked. "Ah, that is M. Jules Sandeau of the French Academy!" And he, on going out, inquired the lady's name. George Sand! What a lot of head-shaking must have ensued! Maxime Ducamp spitefully suggested the following as an epitaph for Louise Colet (who imitated Sand in fiction and worried both de Musset and Flaubert): "Here lies the woman who compromised Victor Cousin, made Alfred de Musset ridiculous, calumniated Gustave Flaubert and tried to assassinate Alphonse Karr: *Requiescat in Pace.*" If this formidable roll-call could be evoked by such an insignificant creature as Colet, what a Homeric catalogue might be sonorously chanted down the corridor of Time in the name of George Sand! Doubtless, we should forgive all if we knew all. Charity covers a multitude of missteps. But we don't know all. We only know too much.

JAMES HUNEKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSIC WHICH TELLS STORIES.*

THE best known of Beethoven's works is the "Moonlight Sonata." Why? He himself did not regard it as one of his most inspired works, and it is safe to say that among his thirty-two sonatas for pianoforte there are more than a dozen which deserve the same popularity, but have never had it. The title alone gave the "Moonlight" its advantage over the other sonatas; and this title was not Beethoven's own, but was suggested by a German critic; nor is it appropriate to the whole sonata, but only to the first movement.

It took the musical world centuries to fully grasp the significance of the fact so graphically illustrated by that word "Moonlight." Until about a century ago it seldom occurred to the composer of a piece of music to attempt anything more than to simply weave tones into beautiful fabrics of diverse patterns. The idea of suggesting pictures or of telling stories was as foreign to his mind as to that of a lace-maker. The sporadic cases in which such things were attempted were regarded as more or less puerile and opposed to the true nature of the art. But gradually one composer after another succumbed to the temptation of overstepping what used to be considered the "legitimate boundaries of music." Concerning Haydn, one of his biographers tells us that he sometimes "imagined a little romance which might furnish him with musical sentiments and color." While Beethoven did not write his most popular sonata with the idea of a moonlit night in his mind, it is known that he did for some years entertain a plan of bringing out a new edition of his works in which the poetic ideas underlying the sonatas and symphonies would be indicated. That he was, however, still intimidated by the old prejudice against pictorial music is proved by the fact that, after writing the Pastoral Symphony, which depicts, according to his own words, a scene by a brook, the merry-making of peasants, a thunder-storm, and the joyful feelings after the storm, he became alarmed, and wrote that this work was intended to be "more an expression of feeling than painting"—an attitude as cowardly as it was inconsistent.

This "hedging," however, did not destroy the effect of Beethoven's example in writing a piece of genuine programme

* "Stories of Symphonic Music." By Lawrence Gilman. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

music. By this example the shy and conservative Mendelssohn was encouraged to follow in his footsteps. Nay, it seems the very irony of fate that he, who was so long the leader of the conservatives, should ultimately have achieved his greatest triumphs in this kind of music. The most poetic and original of all his works are the "Scotch" and "Italian" symphonies, the "Hebrides" and "Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage" overtures, and the "Midsummer Night's Dream," all of which are programme music. Schumann had a way of attaching poetic titles to his pieces after they were written. Then Berlioz and Liszt gradually came to the front with new methods, and finally there remained hardly a composer who did not pay his tribute. As Mr. Ernest Newman has said: "One has only to take up a catalogue of the Russian, French, German, Belgian, American or even English music published during the last twenty years to see how enormously this form of art has grown, and how *the really big men all display a marked liking for it.*"

This triumph of programme music is emphasized by the appearance of Mr. Gilman's "Stories of Symphonic Music." It is devoted entirely to symphonies, overtures and tone-poems which have a story, as distinguished from the so-called "absolute" music which has no alliance with any poetic or pictorial subject; and a glance at its table of contents tells more eloquently than Mr. Newman's catalogue of the important place descriptive music now holds in our concert-halls. Here we find classic and romantic masters like Beethoven, Spohr, Mendelssohn, Schumann, side by side with the more audacious Berlioz and Liszt, not to speak of the unspeakable Richard Strauss and the much-maligned Debussy. France is particularly well represented in the list; for besides Berlioz and Debussy we find in it Bizet, Charpentier, Chausson, Dukas, Franck, d'Indy and Saint-Saëns. Germany contributes, besides Strauss and the four classic and romantic composers just named, Goldmark, Raff, Wagner and Hugo Wolf. Here are also the Bohemians, Dvorák and Smetana; the Norwegian, Grieg; the Russians, Glazounoff, Rimsky-Korsakoff. Tchaikoffsky; the Swiss, Huber; the Hungarian, Liszt; the Finnish, Sibelius. England contributes Bantock and Elgar, while America is represented by Chadwick, Converse, Hadley, Loeffler and MacDowell.

One may accuse Mr. Gilman of sins of omission. It would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been well, not only for patriotic reasons, to include John K. Paine, with his "Spring" symphony, his "Tempest," his "Island Fantasy." To be sure, these are now seldom played, but the same is true of some of the Converse pieces included, or of Hadley's "Salome"; and we are convinced that Paine will live. Nor was it fair to exclude Rubinstein's glorious "Ocean" symphony, which contains enough musical ozone to preserve it another century. Mr. Gilman might retort that Rubinstein did not suggest a definite story, and this is true, so far as the score is concerned; but he told an American admirer (Mr. Upton) that the headings for the different movements, if he had wanted to make use of them, would have been as follows: "First Movement, wind and water; Adagio, an evening on the ocean; Scherzo, dance of Tritons and Naiads; while the idea of a triumphal procession of Neptune and his attendants underlies the finale." Concerning the supplementary movements the composer added, facetiously: "I am trying to get on dry land again."

Rubinstein was, like Mendelssohn, a conservative; and the fact that he, too, did his best work when he left the "absolute" style, so dear to conservatives, to write programme music is another feather in the cap of this species of the tonal art. Professor Niecks, of Edinburgh, goes so far as to claim even Johannes Brahms, the king of the conservatives, as a composer of programme music. He does not make out a strong case; but programme music comes out on top even if Brahms be looked on as an exception. The rule is proved by the fact that no other prominent composer of his time, or of the present day, has written absolute music only.

The change in the attitude of the masters toward programme music is a matter of much greater importance than appears at first sight. It concerns not only the subject matter of instrumental works, but their form also. Before Liszt, composers wrote symphonies in four detached movements which were evolved from march and dance rhythms—"idealized dance forms" they are called by the theorists. Liszt created the symphonic poem, the form of which is conditioned by the development of a poetic idea or story, instead of by the contrast of slow or lively dance measures. And in the words of Wagner: "Is the march or dance, with all the thoughts accompanying this act, a more worthy source of form than, *e. g.*, the idea of the principal and most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

characteristic features in the actions and sufferings of an Orpheus, a Prometheus, etc?" The modern composers have answered this question with a decided "No," by writing their melodies and harmonies with growing predilection in the form created by Liszt, and happily named by him symphonic poem. Of the composers represented in Mr. Gilman's book, sixteen contribute symphonic poems; and he might have added to the list indefinitely by including the names of minor writers. The advantages of the symphonic poem over the symphony were too great to be overlooked. Liszt showed his colleagues not only how to give organic unity to a whole symphonic work, but he emancipated orchestral music from its monotonous pattern of allegro, adagio, scherzo, allegro, and gave it the charm of endless variety by making the form in each case adapt itself to the poetic idea, or story, which forms the subject.

Mr. Gilman fortunately has not indulged in speculative interpretations of his own regarding the poetic content of the works included in his volume. He has taken his information from the scores and prefaces of the composers and other reliable sources. He has also entirely avoided that technical analysis which is always foolish because it is intelligible only to those who do not need it. The information contained in his volume really ought to be printed in the programmes distributed in the concert-halls; for if the picture or the poem imagined by the composer was an aid and advantage to him, it must be so to the hearer. But, in the first place, few concert-givers can go to the expense of printing a long story about each piece played; and, in the second place, it is not wise to attempt to read a programme while the concert is going on; it is too suggestive of the proverbial Englishman on the Rhine who is so intent on reading his Baedeker that he misses the scenery. One should prepare for a concert, as one does for an opera, by reading the libretto beforehand. Many are too indolent to do this, and are punished by getting only half the pleasure they might have enjoyed. Heretofore, concert-goers have been dependent on uncertain programmes for the necessary information concerning the stories of symphonic music; now they can find all this brought together in a well-indexed volume of 359 pages, which is one of Mr. Gilman's most useful and readable contributions to musical literature.

HENRY T. FINCK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A GREAT ENGLISH STATESMAN.*

SIR CHARLES STUART PARKER'S Life and Letters of Sir James Graham is a companion book to his Life of Sir Robert Peel and to Mr. Morley's Life of Gladstone; and it is no exaggeration to say that not since the Life of Gladstone appeared has there been a more valuable addition to English political biography. In the intervening four years there have been several noteworthy additions to this class of English political literature—including the lives of Earl Granville and of the first Earl of Durham, and more recently still the Life of Lord Herbert of Lea, all of whom were at one time or another colleagues of Sir James Graham. But in comprehensiveness, in general importance, and in so far as the rounding out of English political biography of the nineteenth century is concerned, none of these can be ranked so high as this biography of the great statesman who, next to Sir Robert Peel, was most responsible for the epoch-making fiscal and economic reforms which were effected by Parliament between 1842 and 1846—for the rearrangement of Great Britain's fiscal system, which went unchallenged and unthreatened until Mr. Chamberlain came out as a Protectionist in 1903.

As is so frequently the case in English political biography it is the letters and papers that give these new volumes their first-class importance. They are admirably marshalled by Sir Charles Parker, who, as editor of the Peel Papers, is unusually well versed in party conditions, and in the political questions which were at issue during the forty-three years—1818-1861—in which Sir James Graham was an influential personality in Parliamentary and official life. But as with the Peel Papers, Sir Charles Parker takes a circumscribed view of his duties as editor. He furnishes a good sketch of Sir James Graham's early years, of his home environment as a man of large landed possessions in Cumberland, and of his early Radical tendencies. But after 1818, when Sir James entered the House of Commons as Member for Hull, and was well launched in political life, Sir Charles Parker does little more than link the letters and diaries together. In what he writes he evinces no great enthusiasm for his work as editor; nor does any great thoroughness characterize this phase

* "Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, Second Baronet of Netherby, P. C., G. C. B. 1792–1861." By Charles Stuart Parker. Two Vols. Pp. xvi., 447; ix. 483. London, John Murray.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his work. In grouping the voluminous correspondence, he undoubtedly shows much editorial skill; but it cannot be said that care and skill, even as to this important matter, suffice to make the volumes as self-contained as they might have been made without inconvenient increase in their size.

Only to a small degree, however, does Sir Charles Parker's method of editing the Graham Letters detract from their real and permanent value. They throw so much new light on English politics from Peterloo to the eve of the second Reform Act, the adoption of the ballot in Parliamentary elections, and the incoming of the Radicals of the Bright School as a power in the House of Commons, that they will repay close study.

Apart from the intrinsic interest of the letters Sir James Graham's career is quite worth close study; for he was to a great extent a self-made man who, as regards influence on the course of English politics, reached the highest eminence, though he did not at any time in his forty years in Parliament hold any office more responsible than First Lord of the Admiralty or Secretary of State for the Home Department. He was self-made, not in the ordinary acceptance of the term. His father was a territorial proprietor; and Sir James, after he succeeded to the baronetcy, was in possession of an income from twenty-four thousand acres of land, which made him independent of the emoluments of office, and free to act according to his own convictions and judgment, even if so acting meant, as it did on two occasions, the sacrifice of Cabinet rank and of the pay of a Cabinet Minister.

Graham was of the House of Commons in its unreformed days; and many pocket or nomination boroughs, such as those Russell and Gladstone represented in their early years in Parliament, survived as long as Graham was in political life. But Graham never controlled a seat in the House of Commons. He was never able to nominate himself for a safe family borough; and although, when well on in his House of Commons career, he sat at times for two nomination boroughs—St. Ives and Ripon—he held these seats without any ties or political obligations to their patrons; and for the greater part of his career he represented large constituencies, such as the Eastern Division of the County of Cumberland and the City of Carlisle; and again and again he had to fight hard for his seat.

It was no accident of birth that gave Sir James Graham his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political opportunities. He made his opportunities; and from the time he was of the House of Commons his reputation as a debater and as a political speaker in the constituencies, as an administrator, and statesman, continued to grow, and underwent no diminution so long as he was actively in public life. He had a genius for public affairs scarcely less well marked than that of Gladstone. His life and ambitions all centred in the public service; and while, like most Englishmen of the landed class, he was at times careful of his order, and afraid of sweeping changes which might endanger too much the political position of the territorial aristocracy, he was much less mindful of his order than the Whig magnates with whom he was associated in Grey's Reform Bill Administration, and he showed no solicitude for the economic position of the landowners when he was working with Peel for the abolition of the Corn Laws. He was more Liberal than Russell and the Whigs; more Liberal than Gladstone was up to 1861, when Graham's career came to an end. But all through his life he dreaded the least interference with the Established Church in Ireland—which Gladstone disestablished in 1869—and to the end he was convinced that the ballot—which was adopted within a decade after his death, and which has since proved to be one of the most beneficent of English political reforms—would mean little less than revolution.

In spite of Graham's innate conservatism as regards the Church and the ballot, he was essentially a reformer—administrative, financial, and constitutional; and there is no statesman of the first half of the nineteenth century to whom England of to-day owes more than it does to Graham. He was associated with the movement for peace, retrenchment, and reform, long before the Whigs committed themselves to this policy; and he was one of the first members of the House of Commons to assail the civil and the pension lists as they stood in the closing years of the reign of George IV. While an unofficial member of the House of Commons he worked zealously for the removal of civil disabilities from Free Churchmen and Roman Catholics; and after he attained Cabinet rank in 1830, and had become the First Lord of the Admiralty, he was of the committee of the Cabinet that drafted the Reform Bill. Russell, Durham and Duncannon were his colleagues; and he was as insistent as Durham in impressing on the cautious Grey the absolute necessity of receiving from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William IV sanction to the creation of peers to ensure the passage of the bill through the House of Lords.

In 1830 when Graham went to the Admiralty he found its methods of doing business those of the days of Queen Elizabeth. These he modernized; and it was largely owing to his efforts that similar much-needed reforms were made in the business methods of the other state departments; and that the House of Commons secured its present complete control over the spending of the appropriations which it makes each session. He was Peel's right hand in making the sweeping fiscal changes of 1842-46; in re-establishing the income tax; and in remodelling and liberalizing the navigation laws. He opposed the movement of the landed aristocracy to throw local rating charges on land on the Imperial revenue as an equivalent for the abolition of the Corn Laws; and it was Graham who drafted the resolution, proposed by Palmerston in 1852, which, when adopted by the House of Commons—468 votes to 63—ended the movement in and out of Parliament for a re-enactment of protective duties on grain.

Graham also had a foremost part in putting the English civil service on the basis on which it has stood for half a century. He was instrumental in the years that immediately followed the Mutiny in bringing India completely under the control of the British Government, and in throwing open several departments of the Indian service to public competition. For a while after these changes had been made, reform halted; but the extension of the Parliamentary franchise in 1867—the measure by which many nomination boroughs which had survived in 1832 were swept away, and votes were conferred on householders in the boroughs—followed the general lines that Graham had laid down in the debate on Disraeli's abortive bill of 1859. In the first sixty years of the nineteenth century no man who did not reach the Premiership had a greater influence on English legislation than Graham; and it has been unfortunate for his fame that it was deemed expedient to withhold so long from publication the letters and papers which show the great part he had in political life. As a statesman responsible for forward policies—for the making of modern England—he ranks with Peel, Russell and Gladstone; and it is alongside the memoirs of these three statesmen that the Life of Sir James Graham must be placed.

EDWARD PORRITT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"FORTIFICATION."*

THIS book should be in the possession of every United States Senator and Representative, as well as of all persons interested in our national legislation. It is written by the greatest living authority on the subject, the Secretary of the Imperial Defence Committee, from whose views one may dissent only on grounds which will bear the most rigorous investigation.

The work presents the broad principles of fortification, touching but lightly on any of the engineering details. It asks what places should be fortified, why, and to what extent; it takes into account the military value of a fleet; it endeavors to secure adequate protection at the minimum cost; it displays no blind confidence in bricks and mortar, concrete and armor, but appraises them as valuable only when the men behind them are skilful and intelligent; and it reprobates the extravagance of providing at every point a maximum of defence and the uttermost complexity of devices. Some risks must be incurred, unless a nation is financially strong enough to make every harbor impregnable. Had the axioms laid down by this author been observed by our legislators during the past twenty years, we should have been spared the needless expenditure of vast sums of money, and the adoption of complicated machinery, involving the employment of skilled mechanics for their care and operation, in many places where simple mounts would have abundantly answered the purpose. In view of the noble fleet of battle-ships now bearing the American flag, over-elaboration of coast defence seems unnecessary.

The author's views and opinions have been accessible ever since the publication of the first edition of the work in 1890. They were not welcomed by military engineers—quite the contrary; but little by little, step by step, they have forced their way to practically universal acceptance, at least in theory.

The first twelve chapters, while exceedingly interesting and instructive, are not likely to receive much attention in this country, for they deal exclusively with land sieges, a branch of the art of warfare which has not concerned us since Appomattox. Nevertheless, they offer many fertile suggestions, such as:

"It seems clear that in the majority of cases the refinements of detail

* "Fortification." By Colonel Sir George Sydenham Clarke, R.E., G.C.M.G., F.R.S., etc., etc. London: John Murray.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and trace, to which theory has delighted to assign disproportionate importance, exercised no influence whatever over the issue. . . . Broad military principles—not the technical artifices which were dear to Uncle Toby and Major Dugald Dalgetty—appear to have determined the issue in the sieges of this period [the eighteenth century]. Then, as now and always, events declined to take the course prescribed for them."

In these sentences may be found the key-note to Sir George's teaching.

Nor is the book dull reading. The author has a delightful vein of humor, which, cropping out here and there, makes one fearful of skipping, lest choice bits be lost, such as:

"One writer, for example, discovered that the siege of Guisnes in 1558 'brings out very strikingly the value of hidden flanks.' The siege of Jericho would probably afford interesting data as to the stability of revetments, if we were in possession of fuller historical details of the operation."

Speaking of the Napoleonic era, the writer says:

"Defences were short or long, contemptible or brilliant, in accordance with the spirit of the troops, the genius and readiness of resource of their commanders, the available supply of food and ammunition, and not because the fortress was laid out on simple or complex lines. Within broad limits, the nature of the fortifications mattered exceedingly little; general tactical conditions decided the event."

The same lesson is drawn from the episodes of our Civil War.

Nothing happened in France in 1870-71, or at Plevna in 1877, or in South Africa in 1903, to modify the author's conclusions.

The operations around Port Arthur are clearly described and well illustrated. The reasons why they were undertaken are presented and the appropriate inferences are drawn from the conduct of the struggle. This part of the book is especially worth the reading, even if its deductions, happily, are not likely to be applicable to our case.

With the thirteenth chapter, Sir George passes to the "General Principles of Coast Defence." What more true than his calm though disconcerting generalization:

"The primary considerations are, therefore, matters of policy dependent upon national conditions, and varying with circumstances, naval, military and geographical. Unless the coast defences of a maritime country are designed to fit into a harmonious scheme of national preparation for war, they may become sources of weakness by diverting expenditure from essential requirements. Unfortunately, this point of view is usually disregarded, and large sums have been wasted upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fixed defences which could have no value in war, but have been successful in warping national aims and in misleading public opinion. Statesmanship is rare, and technical experts abound, while the palpable and visible means of protection that coast batteries appear to provide necessarily appeal to uninstructed minds with much greater force than the sea-going navy and the field army, upon which alone national security must ultimately depend. Thus, we have seen waves of coast defence which have strewn our shores with derelict fortifications technically bad even in their day, and now worthless, while the requirements of the field army have been uniformly ignored. Similarly, in the United States, the preposterous proposals of the 'Board on Fortification' which demanded more than five and a half millions sterling for the defence of a comparatively unassailable port such as San Francisco, have created extravagant standards attainable only by a people disposing of superabundant funds, and, if attained, adding nothing to national security.

"In this country [England] there are now signs of a rational treatment of the policy of coast defence. It is recognized that the only intelligent basis of schemes of Fortification must be sought in careful estimates of the probable scale of attack, and the Admiralty has accepted the responsibility of preparing such estimates. We may, therefore, hope to arrive at and to maintain a consistent standard which will suffice for all reasonable requirements, and will prevent future waste."

Would that there were some prospect of "a consistent standard" in this country! A glance at our splendid fleet of battleships and a walk along the forts which defend Boston, New York, San Francisco, or indeed any of our leading seaports, will reveal to the thoughtful man a vast and inexplicable lack of adjustment somewhere.

War-ships are not built to assail defences on shore, he says, as a preface to condemning the attack on San Juan by the American Squadron—our only repulse during the war with Spain. We had not profited by the example of the Japanese in 1894, who "gave proof of their mastery of the lessons of war by consistently declining to expose their war-ships to the fire of coast defences." In 1904, the Japanese displayed a like sagacity, or prudence, if the term appears preferable. Five times did they bombard Port Arthur, but in all these cases they were most careful to avoid risks to their ships. Habitually they drew off when the Russians began to obtain their range. It is through such instances as these that we learn to appreciate the rôle of the man-of-war.

The gist of the matter he sums up in these words:

"The principle is that only ports containing resources of national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

importance—resources the destruction of which would directly reduce the capacity of the nation for carrying on war—can be fortified. All other ports must depend upon naval protection alone, and irresponsible threats of bombardment and of the enforcement of indemnities, to which naval manœuvres have accustomed us, can be disregarded. Bombardments would only lead to reprisals, which the superior naval Power can easily carry into effect; while indemnities can only be collected by a process of pillage involving the landing of men."

The chapters on the evolution of coast batteries and battle-ships are extremely interesting. As treating of fundamentals they merit the careful study of military and naval men.

The criticism of so capable a student of the art of war as Sir George ought to be of great service even to the designer of vessels who might well heed this suggestive hint:

"A well-conceived vessel should continue to be a useful element in a navy as long as her structure remains effective. She may sink in the scale and be forced to accept a lower rôle than that for which she was built; but she will generally be worth maintenance and even rearming. On the other hand, a badly designed ship will quickly become obsolete."

It is in what Sir George terms the "adjuncts of coast defence" that are found the best examples of good things carried to excess. Remembering what an intolerable nuisance were the torpedoes planted in our various harbors in 1898, we are hardly surprised to read that Great Britain has decided to withdraw mines from her mercantile ports, accepting the lesser evil of the two.

While it is not agreeable to be made use of to point the moral and adorn the tale, we can hardly challenge his accuracy when he says:

"It is folly to run unnecessary risks; but, at the same time, the exaggeration of fixed defence is doubly impolitic—as a waste of public money and as a misdirection of public opinion;"

or again:

"It is the duty of statesmen to insist that [defences] shall be kept within reasonable bounds, to confine the technical expert within limits laid down by authority, and to disregard popular clamor, which here, as in the United States in 1898, is the natural result of ignorance or misreading of the history of war."

It is in the hands of these very statesmen that this timely work will be able to bring about an extensive and much-needed conservatism, unless Sir George Clarke is hopelessly in error.

A NAVAL OBSERVER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE SEARCH OF BELISARIUS."*

"Sæpius ventis agitatur ingens
Pinus et celsæ graviore casu
Decidunt turres feriuntque summos
Fulgura montes."

JUST now when we are so frequently told that there is a distinct decadence in literary, and particularly in poetical, production, there has been written by Percy Stickney Grant, Rector of Ascension Church in the City of New York, a noble poem, whether we consider it from the point of view of Arnold, that true poetry is but a criticism of life and the highest expression of the best literature, or from the other extreme of Poe, that poetry is merely "the rhythmic creation of the beautiful."

The legend of Belisarius, oddly enough, with all its fascination and pathos, has not been a favorite with the poets. Longfellow has written a short poem called "Belisarius," but neither in conception nor in expression does it present the proportions of the theme.

The story as given by Mr. Grant tells how Belisarius—having won back for the Roman Empire something of its old renown in the world, and having made for himself a place among the foremost generals of all time—is summoned at the opening of the poem before his two sovereigns, Justinian and Theodora, to answer to the charge of treason.

The Forum of the great City; the swaying, feverish crowd with its protest against royal injustice, and its assertion of confidence in Belisarius; the ceremony of the Court; the baseless charge of guilt from the throne, and the simplicity of the defence of the old general, blinded now as a penalty for his greatness—all go to make up a scene alive with movement and color.

His banishment follows; and when he asks, in his grief and blindness, for his child, he hears from the reluctant King that it has been stolen from him. Then, after his wife has sought to atone by suicide for her share in his degradation, Belisarius sets forth in the search for his son.

He is met everywhere with tributes to his name and exploits. To young children, with his hand among their curls, he tells

* "The Search of Belisarius: A Byzantine Legend." By Percy Stickney Grant. New York: Brentano & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the strange lands he has visited, but he learns of them nothing to guide him in his search.

As, wandering on, he kneels in prayer before the entrance of a basilica, maidens, "white-robed like lilies in the isles far west," come to him with their ministering devotion. In words of peculiar beauty he tells them of his gratitude:

> "Daughters of love, your words are like the night
> That weaves its dream-web 'twixt two days of pain;
> I feel the soothing of your presence bright
> Like woods at dusk adrip with silver rain.
> Your words are like the slumbering night's low strain
> Which murmurs to the stars from dark till day;
> A song of myriad life in hushed refrain,
> The song of life that sings to us alway
> Amid our tears, our doubts, disease and Death's decay."

Loyal veterans of his wars urge upon him that he lead a victorious army against the cruel power which had stripped him of his honors and taken from him the light of his eyes and the child of his heart. For a moment the thought of vengeance possesses him, but in the end he turns from it, not merely because

> "Arms cannot strive against eternal laws,
> And whom God hath dethroned man cannot crown,
> Ensceptred by vain might,"

but also for the reason that contemplation has taught him another lesson:

> "My ears can hear the undertone of life,
> The joy, the woe, the wonder and the prayer
> I could not hear amid the din of strife."

As, strengthened in his purpose, he sets forth once more upon his search, a holy man greets him:

> "I welcome thee to a rich solitude,
> Rest for thy body and thy soul is here."

Belisarius, however, has had a glimpse of the Divine other than that which has been vouchsafed to the holy man, and conqueror as he has been of men and of worlds, he must be active, not passive, in the conquest of his own self. His interpretation of the call of God to man—little as he may understand the mystery of existence as manifested in his own misery—is to strive on even though that be to suffer, and to find victory in high endeavor and achievement which the search for his son symbolizes.

He journeys on, until among a group of boys, to whom he re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counts the story of a great deed out of his life, the wanderer, after all his tireless effort, finds his son. But, as he carries the child in his arms, it dies of the sting of an asp, and Belisarius bears his boy but to the grave.

The picture which the story presents—sombre enough with its unmerited suffering and unrebuked guilt—is redeemed from gloom by the great calm of its atmosphere and the noble proportions of its heroic central figure.

Peculiarly fitting for the title-page of the volume are the lines put by Lowell into the speech of Columbus as he sails on his seemingly hopeless search for a new world:

> "Endurance is the crowning quality
> *And patience all the passion of great hearts.*"

The poem is written in the Spenserian stanza, which has been the despair of even the gifted poets other than Byron, Keats and perhaps Shelley. It was a wise selection for a narrative poem, and Mr. Grant has made effective use of its strength and grace. It may serve to emphasize this view if it be added that the preceding quotations are selected merely as illustrative of the method employed in treating the legend, and not because of their superiority to the other stanzas, which frequently are of even greater merit.

If the poem be read aloud, it must be regarded as one of the fine poems of recent years. But, as Mr. Corson in his admirable treatise on English Verse says, poetry must be read aloud. There can be little doubt as to the correctness of this view. To read poetry in silence to one's self, particularly poetry written in the Spenserian stanza or in blank verse, is more or less like attempting to appreciate a great musician's creation by a mere inspection and study of the score. The composer may find satisfaction in such a method, but to others the mute score is largely meaningless, and is waked to life and beauty by the musical instrument, as are the lines of poetry by the human voice.

The appreciative reader will have keen enjoyment in this work of a man of rare intellectual attainments and spiritual insight, and on laying down the volume will find it no easy task to call to mind another living author equally capable of writing such a poem.

JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON; ST. PETERSBURG; PARIS; ROME; WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *January, 1908.*

LOOKING back over the conduct of their domestic and foreign affairs during the past year, Englishmen find little cause for dissatisfaction. It has been throughout Europe, and, indeed, throughout the world, a year of appeasement and settling down. The international temperature is lower than it was twelve months ago; is, in fact, almost normal. Great Britain has been well to the front in a period of unusual and nearly universal *rapprochements*. Her traders in the Far East are beginning to suffer severely from Japanese competition; but the Anglo-Japanese Alliance remains as steady as a rock and, within the last few months, has been officially recognized both by Russia and by France as the basis of Far Eastern peace. The Anglo-French *entente,* which is the pivot of Great Britain's European policy, adds something with each month that passes to its efficacy and steadfastness. With the United States, with Spain, Portugal, Italy and Austria-Hungary, this country has succeeded in maintaining and even strengthening its many bonds of popular and political sympathy. But 1907 will be memorable above all things in the British calendar for the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian Agreement and for the cessation of the Anglo-German war of words. The British people have been exhorted by I know not how many experts to regard the Anglo-Russian Agreement as a needless sacrifice of British interests in Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet; and it is, in my judgment, the fact that, if that Agreement stood by itself and could be considered apart from its reflex influence on British policy in other quarters of the world, Sir Edward Grey would be held to have had considerably the worst of the bargain. But in politics, in international politics especially, nothing stands alone; and in this particular case the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guidance of the experts, with their narrow, localized standpoint, has proved less trustworthy than the common-sense instincts of the uninstructed masses. The British people in general are unreservedly glad that the era of suspicion and pinpricks in Anglo-Russian relations should now be closed. The events of the last few years, the Morocco affair especially, have taught them that it is not a British interest that Russia should be disabled from making her weight felt in the balance of European power. They are delighted that their new-formed friendship with France should now be extended to include the ally of France. They believe, with Sir Edward Grey, that half the difficulties of diplomacy vanish when two Powers approach each other with sentiments of mutual good-will; and if the Anglo-Russian Agreement has contributed to this result they hold it to be well worth a few minor sacrifices.

In regard to Germany the situation, politically and psychologically, is somewhat more complex. There is but one feeling of relief and satisfaction among Englishmen that King Edward and the Kaiser should have found themselves able to resume their personal relations. The results of the Imperial meetings at Wilhelmshöhe last August, and of the Kaiser's prolonged visit to England in November, have been a sensible improvement in the attitude of the two peoples towards one another. For almost the first time in a decade, the British and German newspapers are ceasing to scowl and gird. There is a lull in the tornado of accusations, abuse and recriminations, and a general desire on both sides of the North Sea for a return to sanity. Anglo-German relations are at last being debated without passion and without discourtesy. That is admittedly a great gain. But to discuss unpleasant facts with politeness is not to make them more palatable; and it is being borne in upon Englishmen that there are many facts in Anglo-German relations which cannot be conjured away by smooth words. The chief of these facts is the growth of the German Navy. The new naval programme now under discussion in the Reichstag has opened the eyes of all Englishmen to the conviction that a great crisis lies ahead of them. Dependent for her very existence upon supremacy at sea, Great Britain sees across the North Sea the steady fashioning of a navy which is unlikely, it is true, ever to equal her own, but which must in time come to hold the balance of European sea

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, and which must also make it well-nigh impossible for the British purse to stand indefinitely the strain of the two-Power standard. How far English apprehensions are aroused may be judged from the fact that Mr. W. T. Stead, one of the most ardent of the anti-jingoes, has called upon the Government to lay down two "Dreadnoughts" for every one laid down by Germany. The feeling is biting into Englishmen that the policy of naval construction pursued during the next decade will be big with the fate of the Empire itself.

One other issue of transcendent moment has also emerged during the past year. It affects Great Britain and the British Empire more nearly than any other Power, but it does not affect them alone. I refer, of course, to the relations that are to obtain between the white and colored peoples. The anti-Japanese explosion in British Columbia, the refusal of both Australia and New Zealand to open their sparsely settled territories to Asiatic immigrants, the expulsion of Hindus from Canada, and the steps now being taken by the Transvaal to get rid of the Indians who have flocked over the border from Natal, raise problems which both in themselves and in their influence upon the course of British foreign and Imperial policy deserve the best thought and forethought that the Government can give them. In matters of such intricacy and magnitude, public opinion takes long to crystallize; but I notice the growth of a disposition to consider the suggestion put forward in these letters some months ago—that the first step towards the solution of the question should be a conference between Great Britain, China and Japan.

In domestic politics, the past year has been comparatively uneventful. The Liberals have held their own and start on the new year with a majority virtually undiminished and with few signs that they have yet lost, or are about to lose, the favor of the country. They have passed two admirable measures, one remodelling the organization of the army and the other providing small holdings for agricultural labors. Mr. Asquith's Budget contained two features that redeemed it from the commonplace. One was the setting aside of over two million pounds as a nucleus for an old-age pension fund. The other was the introduction, for the first time in British financial history, of a distinction between earned and unearned income for the purposes of income-tax assessment. The Government also presided

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the Colonial Conference with more success than its opponents have been willing to allow. It could not, indeed, entertain the idea of Colonial preference in fiscal matters, but it made provision for a common system of Imperial defence, it agreed to the organization of an Imperial Secretariat inside the Colonial Office for the special study and elucidation of Imperial subjects, and it took a long step towards the development of steamship communications between the various parts of the Empire. Indeed, both in their Colonial policy and in their handling of a delicate but by no means desperate situation in India, the Liberals have scored unlooked-for successes, the grant of self-government to the Transvaal being in itself a stroke of the finest statesmanship. It is only in Ireland that they have so far conspicuously failed. Mr. Birrell's Devolution Bill, after its rejection by the Nationalists, was withdrawn; the Irish University Bill, outlined by Mr. Bryce just before he sailed for the United States, aroused such an intensity of opposition that it was not even introduced; and Mr. Birrell's actions and speeches in regard to the epidemic of cattle-driving have not impressed English opinion as those of a statesman of firmness and insight. I do not myself endorse this judgment, believing that Mr. Birrell has nearly all the qualities that an Irish Secretary ought to have, and feeling confident that he will yet leave a deep and beneficent mark on the statute-book. Another venture which has also turned out badly is the Government's campaign against the House of Lords. Except perhaps in Scotland, where some excitement was aroused by the rejection of two Scottish Bills in the Upper Chamber, the response to the Prime Minister's call to arms has been inadequate. The issue, however, having been once raised, will have to be fought out: the Bills rejected by the Lords are to be sent back to them during the coming session; and the next general election will almost certainly turn on the relations that are to subsist between the two Houses.

On the whole, the Liberals have good reason to be satisfied with their present position and prospects. They have undertaken to tackle some highly difficult and complicated questions—the licensing question for one, Irish University education for another, English education for a third, and old-age pensions for a fourth—and they are greatly harassed by the pressure of the Labor and Socialist men in the rear and by the shrewd tactics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which these new political forces are adopting in the constituencies. Nevertheless, they are in a far happier state than their opponents, who, besides being a hopeless minority in the House of Commons, have rather lost ground than gained it in the country, and in spite of repeated demonstrations of unity are still almost as much divided as ever on the fiscal issue. The only party, indeed, that is completely contented with itself and feels that the future is its own is the Socialist party. The year that has just closed will always be remembered in English politics as the year in which Socialism, as a definitive and organized political force, first made its appearance in the House of Commons. Socialism has been the great debating topic of the year, and the Socialist campaign in the constituencies has been prosecuted with quite unexampled vigor. But how far the doctrines of Socialism, whether in their stiff Marxian garb or in the more flexible robes of the "Revisionists," have laid hold of the minds of the English masses, it is extremely difficult to decide. From many points of view, there is no country in which Socialism would seem to stand a poorer chance than in England. There is comparatively little of the class spirit here; the English working-man has none of the ferocity of the French proletariat against the black-coated *bourgeoisie;* the lines of separation between the various grades of English society are wavering, coalescent, easily crossed and recrossed; there is no privileged military caste to domineer over all who are outside its ranks; there is no fiscal system setting the country against the town and exploiting the many for the few; the tradition of individualism is still enormously strong and pervasive; the British disdain for theories, for large views and for logical conclusions, and the British instinct for compromise are very far from being exhausted; and the strength of trade-unionism, the vigor and adaptability of English Liberalism, and the fact that the work of social reform has always in Great Britain gone on continuously, are still further obstacles in the path of Socialism, and render it extremely unlikely that it will ever acquire the position and influence it has won in France and Germany.

What is unquestionable, however, is that all sections of the Labor party, whether they are Socialists or not, are gradually coming together on a platform of advanced social reform. Their programme goes very much further than the present Cabinet is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prepared to advance. But it is characteristic of the confusion into which English politics are descending that a large section of the Unionists applaud the Socialists and even seek to outbid the Liberals for their favor. Indeed, the only true Conservatives left in Great Britain nowadays are the Unionist Free-Traders, who, being alienated from their own party by the fiscal question and from the Liberals by the semi-socialistic measures and leanings of the present Government, are relapsing, under the guidance of the "Spectator," into a state of mind on the subject of social reforms that was antiquated twenty years ago, and has been incredible ever since. In their belief, the Unionist party ought to shelve the question of Tariff Reform and concentrate all its forces against any proposals that smack of Socialism. This, however, is very far from being the view of the Tariff Reformers, who constitute the majority in the Unionist ranks. According to them, all who desire social reform must also desire tariff reform, because tariff reform alone can supply the necessary funds for social reform. The Liberals, they argue, will soon disappoint the masses by the inability of "Cobdenite finance" to find the money for old-age pensions and similar experiments. Then will come the great chance of the Chamberlainites to offer social reform in return for tariff reform. The expectation is not impossible of fulfilment, and a union between those who advocate social reform at any price and those who advocate tariff reform at any price is more than conceivable.

Many new Acts came into force on the first day of the new year. The most important of these, and the one from which the most is hoped, is the Small Holdings Act, giving County Councils the power compulsorily to acquire land to be let as small holdings. Another Act, called the Probation of Offenders Act, marks the first introduction into England of a principle that is already familiar in America—the principle of releasing offenders in certain cases on probation, binding them over to good behavior, with or without sureties, for a period not exceeding three years, and appointing probation officers, who may be women, to observe their conduct and "advise, assist and befriend them." A third Act provides for the appointment of a public trustee who is qualified to undertake, for a small fee, all the duties of an ordinary trustee, with the added advantage of being permanent and backed by the Consolidated Funds.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *January, 1908.*

CONTRARY to wont, this letter will touch upon a question of international interest—the commercial rivalry between Japan and the other Great Powers—the full significance of which is certain to be thoroughly grasped, if not to-day, then within the next five years. In some ears these words may sound like mere guesswork. So, too, did the definite foreshadowing of a Russian Constitution made in these pages thirty months ago, when the State was still an absolute monarchy. In June, 1905, the following forecast appeared in this REVIEW: "For Russia the destruction of her fleet means the close of the autocratic epoch and the beginning of a reign of democracy. One-man rule is now virtually dead." Less than six months later, the autocratic fabric had been pulled down, and at present parliamentary institutions are slowly growing up among its ruins. And as it has been with the forecast of the internal situation, so it will probably be with my present presentiment that serious international complications will result from the commercial strivings of Japan.

Nippon's commercial policy in the Far East may well seem to most readers of this REVIEW a matter devoid of actuality. They may argue that Japan cannot shut the Open Door in the face of the whole world and that, if that contingency be eliminated, no other danger is formidable. But if they will assume for a moment that Japan's commercial designs in the Far East may in truth be fraught with importance to the world, the following considerations will probably harden that assumption into a firm conviction and show that a new and unlooked-for turn is being given to the policy of the nations interested in the Far East by the Russo-Japanese Commercial Agreement.

In the course of the negotiations between the two Powers which were carried on for nearly a twelvemonth in St. Petersburg, M. Motono, the Mikado's Minister, made, and M. Izvolsky, the Tsar's Foreign Secretary, assented to, a novel demand which, had its ulterior trend been discernible, might have caused the diplomatic world to prick its ears and rub its eyes. For it is an unmistakable token of the new spirit that is now moving over the face of the Pacific waters, and it warrants the belief that a fresh political tenet is being fashioned which may, if it win recognition, secure for the people of Nippon a privi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leged commercial status in extensive regions of the Far East. It consists of a claim advanced by the Mikado's Government to bestow upon and accept from "Corea *and the countries contiguous to Japan in eastern Asia situated to the east of the Straits of Malacca*" special commercial concessions to which no other Powers, despite their right to the treatment of the most favored nation, shall be entitled.

This claim has already been allowed by Russia; and Japan confidently expects that it will be likewise acknowledged by the United States, Great Britain and the other nations. The innovation came about in this way. The two contracting parties agreed to grant to each other what is known as the most-favored-nation treatment. That is to say, over and above the special tariff concessions and other commercial facilities reciprocally and expressly accorded, they affirmed their willingness to extend to each other the facilities which they have already bestowed, or may hereafter bestow, upon other friendly Powers. Thus, if Russia is expressly obtaining low duties, say, on her rye entering Japan, she would also implicitly, in virtue of the most-favored-nation treatment, enjoy the benefit of the favorable tariff on wheat conceded by Japan, say, to the United States, and on tallow granted, it might be, to the Argentine Republic. To confer these rights upon friendly nations is nowadays the custom. But it is also usual to add a restrictive qualification eliminating from the most-favored-nation clause those special concessions—sometimes mere border facilities for traffic—which are common between, and confined to, neighboring countries. Thus, for instance, the privilege of navigating the Danube in Austrian territory which Austria might allow to Bavaria would, of course, not be shared by Russia, despite her undoubted right in Austria to the most-favored-nation treatment. Well, this restrictive stipulation, which always qualifies the most-favored-nation clause in Russian commercial treaties, was omitted in the Japanese draft of the new commercial agreement. The Russian plenipotentiaries, assuming that the omission was due to an oversight, asked to have the lacking clauses inserted.

M. Motono assented to this, but conditionally. He would add the clause, he said, provided that the same stipulation be applied to kindred privileges which Japan may accord to and receive from her neighbors. "Her neighbors?" the Russians ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claimed. "Yes. Why should an island State be deemed neighborless and debarred from the enjoyment of the valuable commercial and political privileges which continental Powers vindicate for themselves?" "And who are your neighbors?" one can imagine the Russian statesman inquiring of his Japanese colleague. "Our neighbors," was the reply, "are the nations and the peoples living to the east of the Straits of Malacca; the Chinese, the Siamese, the Coreans and the inhabitants of Cochin-China." Truly, a formidable array of peoples and a vast expanse of territory. As M. Motono's proposal was accepted, these millions of Orientals, with their great and increasing purchasing powers, may be enabled to trade with Japan on terms calculated to baffle the most vigorous attempts at competition. Heretofore, Japan enjoyed some natural advantages over her trade rivals in the Far Eastern markets: she is on the spot; she is well acquainted with the peoples of the Far East and their needs, and it is in her power to purchase labor more cheaply than her competitors can. With these odds in her favor, she was winning steadily in the race. But now, if those further privileges be ratified, her competitors will in many respects be put out of the running altogether. Moscow and Lodz, for instance, will hardly have the ghost of a chance. As Russia, not being an industrial nation, had but little to lose by compliance with Japan's demand, while probably she stood to gain considerably, her plenipotentiaries consented.

But the consent was contingent, not absolute. For it would be inconsistent with Russia's dignity were she to contract herself out of rights which her competitors and peers, Great Britain, the United States, Germany and France, continue to enjoy. And for that reason she stipulated that her acquiescence shall not have any practical consequences unless and until those other Powers also assent. Russia owed it to her dignity to make this proviso. Now, what the Mikado's representatives have in view is to induce all the great commercial nations of the world to contract themselves in a similar manner out of those same privileges for the behoof of Japan, Russia being asked to forego them before the others solely because she happened to be negotiating a commercial treaty earlier than they. And the Japanese are so sure of obtaining their end within the next five years that they have agreed that Russia's renunciation shall not take effect until

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other Powers have followed her example. But, as soon as their new commercial treaties with Japan are under discussion, this stipulation will be insisted on as an essential feature of them. And only if it be embodied in the future commercial treaties will Russia be asked to honor her cheque written nearly five years in advance.

Put into concrete shape, then, the innovation means that Japan would fain cultivate much closer commercial relations with the peoples of the Far East—of whom she among all great nations deems herself the only neighbor—than shall be permissible to the other Powers. For these the extreme Orient shall, indeed, keep open its door, but for Japan its portals. According to the new formula, the "special commercial relations" which Nippon may entertain with Siam, China, Corea and Indo-China as with next-door neighbors, and the special commercial concessions which may emanate from these relations, shall not be liable to be claimed by other Powers under the most-favored-nation clause. All other peoples shall be expressly excepted, with their own consent.

This whole story, which may be pieced together from the official protocols of the Conference now printed in St. Petersburg, is on all fours with the arrangement once come to between Japan and the United States, prior to the abolition of consular jurisdiction in the Mikado's dominions. The American Government then agreed that its citizens resident in the Mikado's realm should be subject to Japanese laws and amenable to Japanese tribunals, if other nations would also consent to have their subjects thus treated. And in this action America was alone, no other Power following suit. Consequently, the agreement did not come into force until years after, when Great Britain and the other Great Powers had likewise assented to the abolition of consular jurisdiction. America, however, had by her example exercised a considerable moral pressure upon the other States, for which Japan showed herself duly grateful. Russia acting in a similar spirit to-day is establishing a strong claim upon Japan's gratitude. And when at last the commercial treaties are altered in the sense indicated—assuming that Great Britain and the other Powers do eventually consent to have them modified in this way—Russia will have lost much less by renouncing the special advantages reserved by Japan than will the United States, Great Britain or Germany.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will Japan succeed in persuading the commercial Powers of the world to give her that exceptionally advantageous position in the Far East at which she is obviously aiming? Those who lay stress upon the magnitude of the interests involved will probably answer the question by an emphatic negative. Others who bear in mind the consummate skill, the despair-proof energy and the unflagging perseverance that characterize the Japanese, and who read the future in the light of the past, will be tempted to reply affirmatively.

In Japan's designs, so far as they are revealed or foreshadowed by her attitude at the St. Petersburg Conference, there is nothing calculated to shock or surprise the onlooker. Foreign policies should be dispassionately judged according to the contemporary standard of international ethics. And the moral code of nations to-day extols one-sided nationalism and condemns altruism. Japan, therefore, has done the right thing at the right time. Certainly, it would ill become those who applauded Russia's line of action in Manchuria to cavil at Japan's enterprise in the Far East. The principle underlying the schemes of both States is identical, and international "ethics" identifies it with patriotism. The only difference is that the project of Nippon is much vaster than that of Russia, and has a better chance of being successfully carried out. The only rival who hitherto appeared formidable is now prostrate: her army is demoralized, and her navy is either at the bottom of the sea or flying the flag of Japan.

As an artichoke is eaten leaf by leaf, so a great national scheme like this is realized bit by bit. And the Japanese are persevering and methodical. As their statesmen carried out their design of abolishing consular jurisdiction, so they may gradually get the new restrictive clause introduced into the commercial treaties which must be renewed in a few years. It is natural to begin with Corea and Great Britain. What objection, for instance, can Sir Edward Grey raise to Japan's enjoying exceptional privileges in Corea? Obviously none, for the British look upon the Hermit Kingdom as part of Greater Japan. In like manner, the United States Government may, it is assumed, easily be won over. No well-informed Russian would be surprised to learn that Mr. Taft, during his recent visit to the Tsar's realm, had heard the subject broached by competent observers and that he had displayed no tokens of concern.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARIS, *January, 1908.*

I PROPOSE to record the doings of the Deputies since the beginning of the session seven or eight weeks ago: for the present, there is no other history of France. They have managed to despatch the Budget in this comparatively brief space of time. In countries where the chief business of Parliament is to sanction the taxes, such haste might appear excessive, but the Chamber needs time for its long-contemplated reforms.

The Budget as sent up to the Senate is not absolutely sincere. For several years—in spite of occasional pleasant surprises like a surplus of two hundred millions of francs in the receipts, this year—the Chamber has not succeeded in balancing the Budget, and all it has done has availed only to disguise the deficit. Last year the dodge was to put down to the Budget in hand the proceeds accruing to the Treasury from the Rothschild and a few other large successions, though the duty did not fall due for another twelve months. This year, the Minister of Finance bethought himself of the no less childish method of redistributing between three or four future Budgets twenty-eight million francs to be paid to pensioned State servants, or employed as bounties to the merchant shipping, a heavy burden on French finance. This device was adopted by a large majority who know very well that the average Frenchman invariably skips the portions of his paper devoted to pure finance or to foreign politics. Nor did the Chamber entertain any doubt of the welcome it would receive from the Senate. The senatorial *rapporteur* is M. Poincaré, a man of exceptional ability and absolute integrity, who gave up office as Minister of Finance in the last Cabinet, because he saw that there was no escape from financial shifts if the Chamber were to redeem its promise of an Old Age Pension fund. The Chamber does not much mind a rebuke from the Senate on the subject of finance—it matters very little: the country knows nothing of it, and the second reading of the Budget seldom occupies more than four afternoons, after which the subject is never mentioned. Another measure, popular or, in the language of politicians, *electoral* and economical, has been taken, which the Senate will not find quite so easy to throw out. Three times in the ten or twelve years during which he belongs to the reserve, the French citizen is called back to the colors for periods of thirteen and twenty-eight days. The Chamber felt sure that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would please the electorate, while lightening the Budget, by reducing the longer period to three weeks, and the shorter one to one week. The wisdom of such a step just when the two years' service must necessarily weaken the Army may be questioned. In fact, it brought about the indignant resignation of two veterans in the military Commissions, M. Mézières and M. de Freycinet, twice Minister of War. But few Deputies are strong-minded enough to seek the approbation of military experts rather than that of the laborers who send them to the Chamber. Political considerations rule military as well as religious questions, and the prospect of re-election is the chief factor that moulds our representatives' opinions.

Sums have been voted towards the much-needed revision of the *cadastre* (land assessment), preparatory to the future enactment of the Income Tax. In fact, it is impossible to determine the tax to be paid by each landowner, unless a correct estimate of the actual value of the land be obtained, and the *cadastre* is so obsolete that some land properties pay, when they change owners, the extravagant tax of a hundred and fifty per cent., whereas first-rate estates pay next to nothing because they happened to be waste when the original survey was made. Strange to say, the very wise proposal to revise the cadastral tables had been made—as I hinted above—by M. Poincaré to the last Chamber; it was considered, discussed and finally passed by both Houses; but, the necessary sums having been diverted from their proper channels by M. Poincaré's successor, the Act was not only left in abeyance, but completely forgotten.

For some little while the Chamber had flattered itself that this very useful and apparently harmless measure would save it the ordeal of the debate on the main issue. In point of fact, the revision of the *cadastre* must take place at least every three years, and what is the good of passing an Act that cannot be enforced for three years to come? This reasoning would have seemed urgent, had it not been for M. Jaurès, who pointed out that the present Chamber and present Cabinet have made the Income Tax part and parcel of their programme—that it is, therefore, their duty to pass it, and that the project will be safer if it waits as an Act than if it waits as a Bill.

With the exception of a legal spoliation, to which I will advert at the end of this letter, the Chamber has done nothing else be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sides the ordinary routine of the Budget, and the country thinks it is too little. Unfortunately, the country is only called upon to speak its mind on its representatives one half-day in four years, and it is seldom that an event of particular significance happens so to coincide with a general election as to raise it to the dignity of a national verdict.

There is one question the examination of which will delight all parties except the monarchists of the Right, whose policy is to stand for religious liberty even though they may not care a straw for religion: I mean the revision of the Law on Secondary Education. The conduct of secondary education was until 1850 a State monopoly. After that date M. de Falloux succeeded in passing a law empowering private teachers duly qualified to open and conduct schools. This liberty had long been claimed by Catholics, who insisted that they had a right to see their children educated by masters of their own choosing. Most of these Catholic colleges were managed by priests, secular or regular, and in course of time became as numerous as the State establishments. Naturally they had not the privilege of granting diplomas and the boys were examined for the baccalaureate degree by the official boards. About twenty Colleges were in the hands of the Jesuits and, as might be expected, were mostly frequented by the sons of monarchists or of people anxious to secure for their sons a more or less aristocratic connection. These schools, of course, were antipathetic to the republicans and often denounced by the local radical committees: a great deal of the anti-clerical agitation was directed against them and their suppression in 1901 was looked upon as a triumph over the reactionaries. On the contrary, the schools conducted by the diocesan clergy had no political flag of any sort, and only aimed at turning out well-educated lads with sound religious principles. The masters who taught in them had been at first mere seminary priests; but, as years passed and the standard for the degree grew higher, they became better scholars, and, in the last twenty years, most Catholic schools could boast of a staff with an excellent University education and much broader notions than those of the ordinary parochial clergy. There was nowhere a better chance of reconciling the Church with the spirit of the times.

At various periods, there had been some talk of submitting the unofficial schools to official inspection and nobody thought this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a very serious encroachment on the liberty of teaching. Two or three Bills to that effect have been framed since 1901, the last of which, by M. Chaumié, then Minister of Education, won the approval of both Liberals and the Government. This Bill was waiting for a chance of securing the Chamber's attention when the Disestablishment of the Church brought about the state of tension which the reader cannot have forgotten. Immediately the Leaders of the Left spoke of remodelling the Chaumié project, and in fact a new *rapporteur* was named,—a perfectly unknown Radical-Socialist, M. Massé, with no experience whatever of education—and a new Commission was elected.

In July of last year, M. Massé's report was ready and its conclusions were published. They preserved the main lines of the Chaumié Bill, *i.e.*, equality of rights and charges between the free and the State establishments, but M. Massé introduced a curious exception. "The Commission," he said, "would have liked to please its President, M. F. Buisson, by excluding the clergy from the schools altogether, but it had appeared impossible to give a satisfactory legal definition of a priest, and the Commission had to be content with excluding the clergy from the direction of establishments but not from teaching." This extraordinary statement amazed the few experts who take an interest in the question. If it was impossible to find a correct definition of a priest as teacher, how was it possible to find one of a priest as manager? Anti-clericalism having nothing to do with logic, no answer was ever given.

In September the Papal Encyclical against Modernists appeared and the feeling it created dispensed M. Massé from seeking explanations. Clearly, to the Radical mind, a clergy who received and consented to act upon such an anti-scientific document *ipso facto* declared themselves unequal to the task of educating French citizens. These gentlemen did not take the trouble to observe that many—I should say most—of the so-called Modernists blamed by the Pope were professors in Catholic Colleges.

The probable consequence of this wholesale view is that M. Buisson will rise during the debates and move the complete exclusion from the schools, of the clergy, whether legally defined or not. This would take their bread from about fifteen hundred French citizens with University degrees, against whom no exception could be taken if they did not happen to be priests.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

My American or English reader will not fail to ask me whether the immorality of excluding French citizens from rights open to all the French nation will not strike the majority and cause some wavering among them. The fact is that one must live in France to realize how politicians can always bring themselves to view things politically and apart from any moral consideration. Men who would not take a penny from a Rothschild will have no hesitation in robbing a whole category of citizens just to please a Minister. The instance with which I am going to conclude happened only six weeks ago and is most instructive.

The Pope's prohibiting the French Bishops against forming "*associations cultuelles*" (associations for public worship) entailed the loss of all Church property. But in some cases the property was of such a nature as to enable individual claimants to dispute the confiscation. For instance, there existed in most dioceses funds for aged priests which had at first been appropriated by the Treasury, but which the efforts of the well-known Abbé Lemire will probably succeed in transferring to municipal charities, with the charge of paying the pensions till the death of all the old priests concerned. The case I am noticing is very similar. Nothing is more frequent among Roman Catholics than the endowment of religious services for the dead. The state used to recognize these foundations, provided the capital bequeathed was invested in stocks. No Catholic *associations cultuelles* being forthcoming, the Treasury appropriated the endowments, and, as a consequence, the services were suspended. The testators' heirs no less naturally sued the Government, and, the law being glaringly in their favor, obtained satisfaction from all the Courts they applied to. Unfortunately for the heirs and for justice, it is those very judgments that the Chamber has just coolly quashed, deciding, moreover—to add insult to injury—that the claimants shall pay the legal expenses of all the cases originally decided in their favor.

No such contempt of justice had been seen in France even during the worst days of the Revolution. A jubilant Socialist judged the situation by exclaiming on giving his vote: "At last we see a real blow struck against private property!"

P.S.—The Senate has just sent the Budget back to the Chamber, after substituting for the shifts proposed by the Minister a loan of twelve million dollars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROME.

A VERY serious question which must be dealt with effectively in Italy is that concerning the railways, especially under two aspects, both very important: (1) the bringing up of the system to modern requirements and to meet the extraordinary development of traffic in the Peninsula, and (2) the controlling of the pretensions, which are often excessive, of the railway servants.

As is known, the Italian railways were ceded, in 1885, when the finances of the State were at very low water, to private companies for a period of twenty years. The statesmen who had recourse to this measure thought they had solved the railway problem in the best interests of the State, as while freeing the Government from the heavy expenses which the construction and management of the lines implied, and securing to it at the same time a considerable participation in the dividends, they hoped that the spirit of competition between the different companies would ensure an efficient and constantly improving service. In reality, the companies merely worked the lines in their own interest, to such a point that when, in July, 1905, the State decided to take them over, it was found that the 10,000 miles of railways, forming the whole system, were practically so worn out as to require thorough renovation in every department, especially in that of the rolling stock, which was in a complete state of decay. For instance, every year 60,000 trucks had to be hired, representing a loss of twenty per cent. on what they produced. The engines were inadequate in number, antiquated in type, and in bad condition, and the passenger carriages in many cases unfit for use. Despite these facts, however, public opinion exercised such strong pressure in favor of State ownership that Parliament almost unanimously approved their being taken over, and voted in different bills $182,000,000 to be invested in laying double tracks on all those lines the returns of which exceed a certain amount, in strengthening all the main lines, so as to be able to carry the heaviest and fastest trains, in transforming them from steam to electricity, in adapting every new installation or change to three times the present requirements to meet the constantly growing traffic, and, finally, in renewing and nearly doubling the present rolling stock. For this last item, as all the manufactories in Italy had received Government orders which would keep them busy for several years, com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missions were given abroad for engines, and cars already built were bought, including some from America. But it is estimated that the work undertaken cannot be completed in less than ten or twelve years even with foreign aid.

The question of the men is much more serious. Although, with the passage of the lines into the control of the State, they have become public officials, they, understanding the enormous power which they can exercise through their Union, abuse it, augmenting their pretensions constantly. While the Government does not interfere in strikes, except to protect the liberty of those who wish to work, the strike of public officials is considered a crime, severely punished by the penal code. The trouble arises when, as in the Milan strike, the strikers number several thousands, and are backed by the threat of a general strike not only on the railways, but among all classes of workmen. Indeed, the situation tends to grow worse just because of the complete solidarity existing among all working-men of all classes.

The strike of 7,000 railway servants in Milan and Lombardy was, in fact, only to express sympathy with the gas employees of that town, who, by the time the railway people struck, had already settled their quarrel with their employers. When the railways were taken over by the State, the Government was, for the first time, confronted with the dilemma of either not applying to the railway strikers the punishments established, thus losing all authority and encouraging the men in their rebellion, or enforcing the law and facing a general strike. The Government was rather in favor of treating the matter with great indulgence, but conservative elements, both in the country and at Court, exercised such an influence as to make it clear that too weak an attitude would have unpleasant consequences. As a kind of compromise, therefore, sixteen of the leaders of the strike were dismissed. The railway people thought at first of answering immediately by a general strike, but this was impossible through the opposition of the Socialist leaders, who preferred inaction rather than risk the advent of a Cabinet of repression. Public opinion, however, is inclined to believe that it will be difficult to avoid the experiment of a general strike promoted by the railway people in revenge. To that end they make claims for the reduction of their work to eight hours daily, and for one day free in the week.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To realize to what extent such claims are nothing but impositions, it must be known that the Italian railway employees are among the best treated in Europe, the State securing to them a good pension, insurance against accident, free medical attendance and medicines, and additional wages for those who live or travel in malarial districts. The expenses of the Department of the Railways for the men and the administration absorb in Italy sixty per cent. of the gross returns against forty per cent. in other countries. The railway employees even considered to which alternative, in case of non-acceptance of their terms, it would be better for them to have recourse instead of to the strike —to obstructionism, that is, the too literal carrying out of the regulations, or to *sabotage,* the secret injuring of railway material. It would make little difference which of these methods should be employed, as those adopting the former would subject themselves to punishment as strikers, and any one committing *sabotage* would be liable to dismissal and to five years' imprisonment besides.

WASHINGTON, *January, 1908.*

A REPORT is current in Washington that Mr. Roosevelt has predicted that Secretary Taft will have over six hundred votes on the first ballot. The computation will not bear analysis. It assumes that the Secretary will get all the delegates from Southern States, and all those from the Far Western States, and a majority of those from New York, New England and Ohio. It is tolerably certain that Minnesota and the two Dakotas will instruct for Senator La Follette, who is also sure of his own State, Wisconsin, at least on the first ballot. It is doubtless true enough that Mr. Taft will have a larger number of votes than any other candidate on the first ballot; but it is also likely that these will fall materially short of giving him a majority, and the fact that they will be derived largely, if not mainly, from States certain to give their electoral votes to the Democratic nominee, will not tend to commend him to far-sighted politicians who want to see their party win at the ballot-box. The fact, also, that the Secretary of War cannot expect to have behind him an undivided delegation from his own State casts grave doubts on his availability. It is generally believed in Washington that, under certain circumstances, Governor Hughes could get a good deal of support

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from New England, but he can hardly hope for an undivided delegation from New York, in view of the adverse position taken by President Roosevelt and the latter's adherents. The pivotal importance of the Empire State in the coming campaign is fully recognized by politicians on both sides. One has ceased to hear much talk about Vice-President Fairbanks's chance of obtaining the nomination, though he remains assured of Indiana's delegates. More is said about Speaker Cannon, but that is because the House of Representatives is full of his personal friends, and because he is known to have, beyond any other candidate with the possible exception of Senator Knox, the confidence of the Stand-Patters. Senator Knox will have Pennsylvania, but, apparently, no other State on the first ballot. He is, however, as we have intimated, the second choice of the Stand-Patters.

Until three or four weeks ago, it was generally conceded among Democratic politicians at the Federal capital that, although few of them wanted him, Mr. Bryan could probably count on obtaining a third nomination for the Presidency from the Democratic National Convention which is to be held in Denver. The spirit of resignation and despair seemed almost universal, although experience has shown that, in Democratic national conventions, owing to the two-thirds rule, it is relatively easy to defeat the most prominent candidate.

It is evidently a recognition of this fact which has caused the New York "World" to announce that it will designate sixteen candidates for the Democratic nomination, any one of whom, if selected, would be more likely to be chosen Chief Magistrate than would Mr. Bryan. This announcement, followed as it has been by successive demonstrations, has produced what may be termed a sensation in Washington. The "World" began by designating a Western candidate, John A. Johnson of Minnesota, who was chosen Governor by a small majority in 1904, when Mr. Roosevelt swept the State for President by a plurality of over 160,000. In 1906, Mr. Johnson beat his Republican competitor for the Governorship by more than 76,000. An Eastern candidate proposed by the "World" is Judge Gray of Delaware. Unquestionably his own State will send a Gray delegation to Denver, and his nomination would appeal eloquently to the Democrats of Pennsylvania.

Of all the candidates, however, thus far proposed by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"World" the most promising is Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton University. As a native of Virginia, who practised law and married in Georgia, he would be the first Southern man nominated for the Presidency by a National Convention since James K. Polk of Tennessee. As such, he would almost certainly carry such States as Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri, States that in recent years have once or oftener been detached from the Democratic column. As a man who for many years has been a professor in Northern institutions of learning, and who for some six years has been President of Princeton, he would powerfully commend himself to the Northern section of the Union, and beyond a doubt would carry the States of New Jersey and New York. There is no reason, either, why Woodrow Wilson, as a tariff revisionist, should not run well in Massachusetts, which elected a Democrat, Mr. Douglas, Governor in the Presidential year of 1904, and in Ohio, which also elected a Democratic Governor in 1905.

There is no doubt that a large appropriation for coast and insular fortifications will be requested at the present session of Congress, and the request seems likely to be granted, owing to the existence of a good deal of disquietude concerning the defenceless condition of our possessions in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean. It also begins to look probable that the bill increasing the pay of officers and men in both the army and the navy will become a law. A large increase in the number of battle-ships is demanded by public opinion, in view of the fact that we require a powerful fleet in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, and in consideration also of another fact, that Germany's revised naval programme provides for the addition to her navy of three first-class battle-ships yearly, up to and including 1911 If, now, the American Congress should enact that no fewer than *four* first-class battle-ships shall be laid down by us annually, up to and including the year last named, we should soon have a mightier fleet in the Atlantic than we have just sent to the Pacific, and we could maintain it at its full fighting strength, if we should assume that the life of a modern battle-ship is only about twenty years, after which it becomes obsolete, and if we should, consequently, arrange to lay down the keels of two battle-ships a year after 1911. In that case, we should always remain a maritime power second in warlike capacity to Great Britain alone.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

Jealousy as a Curable Disease and as an Admirable Attribute.

Because the world continues to wag much as it did when Malory wrote, "There befele a Ialousye betwixe kynge Marke and Sir Tristram, for they loved bothe one lady," we are greatly interested to hear from France that the most erudite of modern scientists are convinced that at last they feel justified in pronouncing jealousy a disease, like consumption, which, while not invariably curable, may yet be eradicated in most cases by enlightened treatment. The malady, according to these notable discoverers, may be traced through three distinct phases: "First, jealous hyperesthesia, or morbid excitation of sentiments attended by uneasiness or fear; second, jealous monomania, which is a real mental disease leading to the mania of persecution; third, jealous insanity, which is the last stage of the two preceding phases, and this should be treated like any other form of insanity." The conclusion logically follows that jealousy is only an affliction of the nerve centres of the brain and can be readily modified by the use of such ordinary therapeutic remedies as cold douches and bromides. The experiments now being made we shall follow with keen interest, for the reason that a successful demonstration of the efficacy of the new treatment would obviously tend to exercise a material influence upon the intellectual and moral development of the human race; and yet we are constrained to question whether any actual advantage is to be gained by dealing with this disorder through exclusively scientific means.

It has become the custom of thoughtless and heedless persons to regard jealousy in all of its manifold forms as obnoxious, and its manifestation as discreditable; and so, undoubtedly, in its most vulgar phase it should be considered even by the thoughtful and heedful. One Pittacus, for example, as good and just and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wise a man as lived in his day and generation, was probably justified in begging from the Senate of Marseilles the privilege of killing himself because of the increasing clamor from the "jealous head" of his wife. Nor may we dispute the wisdom of the judicial body, which well knew and valued his worth, in acceding to his request, despite the lamentable and in our judgment unwarranted bitterness indicated by his positive general declaration to the effect that there could be no happy marriage, except that of a blind woman to a deaf man. That the services of such an one should have been lost to the world for a cause so trifling to mankind as a whole, however exasperating to the individual, is, of course, regrettable; but there must have been inherent weakness of some sort in a man who would resort to a remedy which, from time immemorial, has been considered cowardly, and the attempt to employ which is to-day a misdemeanor under the law in a number of our States. A jealous wife, as we all know from sympathetic observation of the affairs of our neighbors, is a severe trial; but, clearly, a man's duty to his fellow men should restrain him from pursuing a course which opens the way for her to foist her clamor upon another, and perhaps others, equally helpless. It is a matter of grave consideration whether the appropriation of a moderate sum of money for the building of a ducking-stool would not have better served both the Senate and the Senator.

But we suspect that the form of jealousy whose cure by the use of bromides and douches is pronounced by the French savants to be practicable is that defined by Addison as, "The Pain which a man feels from the apprehension that he is not equally loved by the Person whom he entirely loves." This variety of suffering is not uncommon, and frequently ends in homicide followed by suicide. The mind of the man thus afflicted is not necessarily abnormal; it may be only sensitive and resentful. Even in these comparatively enlightened days, barbaric notions prevail as to the superior rights of the male; and it is as instinctive among humans as among beasts to feel a sense of deprivation of just dues if affection be not returned upon demand. Consequently, to the warped judgment murder becomes a mere act of justice, and self-destruction follows naturally to evade the penalty of the law. Underlying all motives is the common and unreasoning misconception that love can be acquired by insistence upon a fancied or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even real right to its possession. If persons thus afflicted, whose tragical doings are recorded daily and we fear with growing frequency in the newspapers, would emulate the example of Pittacus and restrict their activities to attempts upon their own lives, there would be little cause for grief; but unfortunately this happens so seldom and the efforts, moreover, are so often unsuccessful that we are disposed to welcome any discovery that would tend to save for others the lives even of ladies of flirtatious disposition.

But further than this we could not conscientiously go, for the reason that in all other phases jealousy has always seemed to us one of the most admirable and attractive of the traits directly bequeathed by divinity to humanity and shared with substantial equality by both. The minor prophet, Pusey, correctly interprets the Old Testament's recognition of the attribute as one "whereby God does not endure the love of His creatures to be transferred from Him or divided with Him; it is twofold; an intense love, not bearing imperfections or unfaithfulness in that which it loves and so chastening it; or not bearing the ill-dealings of those who would injure what it loves, and so destroying them." From this comprehensive definition sprang the application to human affairs as voiced first by Bolingbroke when he marked the difference between jealousy and distrust, saying, "Men may be jealous on Account of their Liberties, and I think they ought to be so, even when they have no immediate Distrust that the Persons who govern seek to invade them," and reiterated by Emerson in the characteristic phrase: "The jealousy of every class to guard itself is a testimony to the reality they have found in life." In this broad, wise sense no nobler trait can be found in either divinity or humanity, and no exception can be taken to the direct declaration forbidding the worship of graven images, "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God," as the best of His creatures are to this day jealous men and jealous women, conserving in real stability the rights of others by insisting upon their own.

"Yankee Doodle" and Peace.

We have received the following letter from Albion, New York:

"Sir,—I notice that you attribute the origin of 'Yankee Doodle' to the English. Another authority—published in 1839—says: 'Yankee Doodle' (or 'Iankhe Doule') is of classic origin. It was chanted by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tuneful sons and daughters of Miletus, certainly in the days of Herodotus, and perhaps in the days of Homer.' This same authority says, further, that 'Yankee Doodle' ('Iankhe Doule') are Greek words meaning, 'Rejoice, O Slave!' or, 'Let the enslaved rejoice. . . .' The American version is evidently indigenous, and has not been transmitted through the English, to whom, indeed, the original appears to be wholly unknown.

"'Father an' I went down to camp,
Along with Captain Good*ing*,
And there we see the *gals and boys*,
As thick as *hasty pudding*.

. . . . . .

"'Yankee Doodle, be a man!
Yankee Doodle Dandy,
Yankee Doodle, kiss the gals,
Sweet as 'lasses candy.'

Indian corn was unknown to the English until the discovery of America, but was known to the ancients—at least 450 B.C.'

"These sketchy extracts which I have quoted are from an article published in *The Democratic Review*, February, 1839.

"Your whimsical assertion in the current REVIEW—that you 'continue to regard yourself as a lover of peace'—fills me with the liveliest admiration not unmixed with awe. Would it be indiscreet to inquire just what you mean by 'a lover of peace,' as applied to yourself? As an unprejudiced reader of your Diary, I *have* thought that you habitually used a frolicsome stick of dynamite, rather than the innocuous pen, when you playfully prod the shy widows, or gleefully prance across the outraged angularities of our esteemed spinsters. But when you had your merry fling at the funeral directors, I felt that it behooved the world at large to tread softly and speak low lest we provoke a characteristic explosion, liable to scatter consternation for miles around, and to permanently cripple the tender sensibilities of many innocent and hitherto harmless widows, spinsters and the like. I earnestly hope that the coming year will produce as many more of your agreeable rows among the fair sex as you can conveniently precipitate in order that the twelvefold pleasure I am anticipating shall not be marred.

"I am, sir, etc.,

"B. FAWCETT."

An ephemeral Review can hardly be accepted as an "authority" upon matters of grave historical concern, and yet there is a semblance of justification in the mere accuracy with which the Greek words are translated. In other respects, we are forced to observe, the letter is tinged with a spirit of frivolity. Assuredly we love peace, and are willing, if necessary, to fight for it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ERRATUM.

The last line of the first paragraph on page 199 should read "as a mediæval Cæsar possessed of the opposite qualities," instead of "as the deadly foe which must be overthrown at all hazards."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED